

LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND BISHOP HOBART,

OCCASIONED BY THE

STRICTURES ON BIBLE SOCIETIES,

CONTAINED IN

His Late Charge

TO

THE CONVENTION OF NEW-YORK.

BY A CHURCHMAN
OF THE DIOCESS OF NEW-YORK.

Jay, William, 1789-1858.

The beginning of strife, is as when one letteth out water.—*Proverbs*, xvii. 14.
Mark them which cause divisions and offences.—*Rom.* xvi. 17.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. HAVEN,
THEOLOGICAL BOOKSELLER, 182 BROADWAY.
Gray & Bunce, Printers.

1823.

2380

29159

Pamphlet Collection
Duke Divinity School

LETTER, &c.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

HOWEVER much, as a Churchman, I may deplore the opposition of my Bishop to the distribution of the uncommented Scriptures ; yet as a friend to the American Bible Society, I cannot regret, that you have thought proper to renew hostilities against that institution. You have engaged in a warfare, in which the cause of the Bible, has been always crowned with victory, and in which the mortification of defeat has ever been imbittered by the conviction, that the power of the victor, has been confirmed and extended by the very endeavour to shake it. In such a warfare, no friend of the Society can for a moment hesitate to engage, through apprehension of the issue—nay, the very stripling whose youthful limbs refuse the burthen of the coat of mail, and the sword of the warrior, may fearlessly enter the field, trusting alone to that God, in whose cause he combats ; and with no armour but truth, and no weapon but common sense, he will most assuredly vanquish the proudest Goliath that may dare him to the fight.

The only enemies the Bible Society has reason to fear, are inattention to its claims, and ignorance of its proceedings. Whoever subdues these foes : whoever brings home to the consideration, and to the Christian sympathy of the community—the holy purpose—the pure and sacred fellowship, the stupendous labours, and the mighty triumphs of the Bible Society, ought to be enrolled among its greatest benefactors ; and few are more deserving of this distinction than the Bishop of New-York. It is true, that your late charge, having been delivered in the ordinary routine of official duties, is not so well calculated to attract public notice, and of course to advance the interests of the Society, as was the

address which you inserted in the newspapers,* at the critical moment when the institution, in the feebleness of infancy, was struggling for existence. The powerful patronage which immediately poured in upon the Society, and the ardent zeal with which many distinguished Episcopalians immediately espoused its cause, attest the extent of the service which you rendered on that occasion. But although your charge will not probably engage so large a share of the public attention as was bestowed upon your address ; it happily abounds in matter admirably adapted to awaken the reflections, and arrest the feelings of all who read it. A document in which the name of a venerable Prelate, who may justly be styled the father of the Bible Societies in the United States, is made use of to sanction your opposition—a document in which the conduct of Governor Jay and General Clarkson, is represented as erroneous in principle, and injurious in its tendency to that church which it is admitted they adorn ; because in the evening of their days, they are labouring to spread the knowledge of that Gospel which has been the guide of their youth, and is now the consolation of their old age—a document in which that mode of disseminating religious truth which has been officially and earnestly recommended to the Episcopalians of the United States by their Bishops assembled in Convention, is denounced as a departure from the apostolic mode of propagating Christianity, as calculated to produce indifference to the essentials of Christianity, and to weaken the zeal of Episcopalians for the ministry, the worship and the ordinances of their Church—will not—cannot be read with indifference. Episcopalians must inquire, are such men as Governor Jay and General Clarkson, and a host of others, whose piety, talents and rank, reflect lustre on our Church ; are they sapping her foundations ; are they violating their duty as Christians and as Churchmen ? Have our Bishops indeed betrayed their sacred trust, and are they inviting us, by their example, by their charges, and by their pastoral letters to a course of conduct erroneous in principle, and dangerous in tendency ? Is Bishop Hobart the only wise and faithful shepherd ; and have White, Claggett, Kemp, Moore, Griswold, Dehon, and Chase, been only blind leaders of the blind ? Such inquiries, Sir, must be made, and

* See N. Y. Evening Post of 13th May, 1816, two days after the formation of the Society.

when made, they must lead to investigation; and what the result of that investigation will be, no friend of the Society can for a moment doubt.

You have thought proper to introduce into your strictures on Bible Societies, a long extract from a late charge by Bishop White, and although you do not expressly inform us that the Bishop concurs with you in opinion respecting these associations, yet no stranger to his sentiments would, for an instant, hesitate in believing this to be the case. You preface the extract, with remarking, "From my official station, I have so many opportunities of observing the powerful claims of destitute congregations upon the zealous exertions, and liberal contributions of their brethren, and their wants so often press upon my feelings, that I cannot cease to lament, that so large a portion of the bounty of Episcopalians, flows in a channel over which their own church has no control, and from which, it derives no immediate advantage. One would think it obvious, that it is the duty of Episcopalians consistently and zealously to bend all their efforts to the advancement of their own church, and to 'avoid all admixture of administrations,' and of exertions, 'in what concerns the faith, the worship,' and the ministry of the church. On this subject, there is so much sound wisdom, of correct principle, and of decided and true policy, united with Christian meekness and benevolence, in the observations contained in a recent address of the Bishop of the Church in Pennsylvania to the convention of his diocese, that notwithstanding their length, I am induced to lay them before you."

Here let us pause to inquire, what is the precise *subject*, on which Bishop White has displayed so much wisdom and policy. Surely it must be the same which causes your ceaseless lamentation, and which ushers in the extract, viz. "that so large a portion of the *bounty* of Episcopalians, flows in a channel over which their own church has no control, and from which it derives no immediate advantage." Being thus led to take it for granted, that the subject of Bishop White's observations, is the injudicious direction given by many Episcopalians to their *bounty*; we are prepared to apply every remark, as far as it can be applied, to the union of Episcopalians in Bible Societies.

The Bishop commences with declaring in substance, that the conduct becoming Episcopalians towards their fellow Christians of

other denominations, is a subject on which he wishes to record his opinion. He points out the inconveniences to be apprehended, from "an intermixture of administrations in what concerns the faith, the worship, or the discipline of the church," "On some occasions," where this intermixture had been permitted, he says, "our institutions have been treated with disrespect, and doctrines unknown to them, taught within our walls." To guard against the imputation of bigotry, the Bishop deems it necessary to be more particular in assigning his objections to this intermixture, and goes on to show that our church differs essentially from others in her government, worship, and doctrines, and that that liberality is to be avoided, which would surrender any of these sacred possessions. He concludes with declaring, that under a conviction of the truth and importance of these sentiments, he has embodied them in his charge, that they may remain recorded upon the journals of the convention.

Such is a brief, but faithful summary of that part of the Bishop's address which you have seen fit to call to your assistance, in your present attack upon the Bible Society. "A strict adherence to these principles" (the principles of Bishop White) "must, indeed," you observe, "be considered as required by the exigencies, and even the existence of our church. The spirit of them seems to me applicable to all associations for religious purposes, where Episcopalians unite with those severed from them by diversity of worship, discipline, or by contrariety in points of doctrine." You then proceed to apply these principles directly to the union of Episcopalians in Bible Societies, which, you declare, seem to you to be "erroneous in the principle on which, in order to secure general co-operation, they are founded—the separation of the Church from the Word of God—of the sacred volume, from the ministry, the worship, and the ordinances which it enjoins, as of divine institution, and the instruments of the propagation, and preservation, of Gospel truth."

Bishop WHITE's principles are thus, so dovetailed with your own remarks, that a superficial reader could scarcely fail to presume that the Bishop himself, intended to apply his principles to the "intermixture" of Episcopalians in Bible Societies, with Christians of other denominations. Happily, however, the copy of the address from which you quote, is not the only one that has reached

New-York ; and, astonishing as it may seem, the following passage *precedes* the extract you have made.

“ Although the Bible Society of this city (Philadelphia) is not
 “ peculiarly attached to our communion, yet the object is not only
 “ of *supreme importance*, but that in which *all denominations of*
 “ *Christians agree* ; and as it contributes its share to the great de-
 “ sign of publishing the glad tidings of salvation where they have
 “ been hitherto unknown, and of depositing the record of them in
 “ the hands of the destitute of all countries nominally Christian, it
 “ has been presented to the notice of the convention *for many*
 “ *years past* ; and under the continuance of the impression, there
 “ is now declared a deep conviction of the importance of the sub-
 “ ject.”

Not only had your eye glanced over this declaration, before it fell upon the passages you have deemed it expedient to quote ; but at the moment you were transferring them to your own charge, you could hardly avoid recollecting, that Bishop White was one of the founders of the earliest Bible Society established in this country ; that he was placed at the head of this society, which place he still holds, that he has frequently as in the present instance recommended the Philadelphia society to the patronage of his clergy and other Episcopalians in his convention charges ; that he has caused sermons to be preached, and collections made for its benefit in his churches ; that he was instrumental in forming a Female Bible Society, and published an address vindicating the propriety of such an association ; and that with a full knowledge of the objections of *some* Bishops in England, and of *one* in this country, he still continues the firm and zealous supporter of the Bible cause. Under these circumstances, while we fully appreciate your candour in the use you have made of the name of your “venerable father in the episcopacy,” and of the obligation you have conferred upon him, by attempting to show that his own principles, condemn his conduct, suffer me to vindicate him, from this apparent inconsistency.

It is believed, that Bishop White’s remarks, respecting “an intermixture of administrations” arose from the circumstance of a Presbyterian Clergyman having preached from an Episcopal pulpit, shortly before the sitting of the convention. Hence it is, that the Bishop remarks, that from an indulgence in this improper

"intermixture," doctrines unknown to our church have been taught within her *walls*, and he proves that we cannot permit this "intermixture," without sacrificing at least for the time, our Episcopal government, our doctrines, and our forms of prayer; and he very logically concludes, that "we must, to be consistent, interdict all other than an Episcopalian *ministry* within our bounds." The whole address relating to this subject is written with a spirit of meekness, Christian charity and kindness, worthy of imitation in other dioceses. In short, the substance of this excellent address is simply this. "I exhort you my brethren to lend your countenance and support to the Bible Society. From this association with your fellow Christians, of other names, no danger or inconvenience need be apprehended—no compromise of principle is required, or expected. But it is also my duty, to caution you, not to intrust your *flocks* even to the occasional care of other shepherds. Let no person who differs from us in doctrine, in the forms of public worship, or in ecclesiastical government, minister in holy things to the people committed to your charge, and for whose souls, you must give account."

Having thus, Sir, discovered, that this truly venerable Bishop, far from being my opponent, is my firm, zealous and consistent ally, I proceed with increased confidence in the goodness of my cause, to consider the various objections you have urged against it.

You seem to think it obvious "that it is the duty of Episcopalians, consistently and zealously, to bend *all* their efforts, to the "advancement of their own Church." The efforts to which you allude, are I presume, efforts for the spiritual improvement of others, and after much reflection, I am unable to extract from this passage any other meaning, than, that it is the duty of Episcopalians not to make any efforts for the spiritual improvement of others, which do not, at the same time, tend to the advancement of their own Church. You do not inform us, what limits you attach to "our Church." Is it only the Church in this diocese? or does it comprehend the "Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States?" Or lastly, do you admit the right of doing good, on the condition of advancing the interests of any Church governed by Bishops, Priests and Deacons; thus presenting as the objects of our zealous and consistent efforts, the Churches of Rome, England, Russia and others! Recollecting that you lately gave your official

sanction to certain efforts made in this diocese to afford pecuniary assistance to the Church in Ohio, I am bound to conclude that you recognize a community of interests in all the American Churches. Your opinion, then, as far as I can understand it, is that *it is the duty of the Episcopalians in the United States not to make any effort for the spiritual welfare of others, unless such effort tend at the same time, to the advancement of the Episcopal Church in this country.* Of course I violate my duty, in making an effort to promote my neighbour's salvation unless by so doing I advance the interests of my own Church in particular; otherwise, your remark totally fails in its application to Bible Societies.

A higher authority than an Episcopal charge, while it urges us to do good, especially to them who are of the household of faith; at the same time enjoins it upon us, as we have opportunity, to do good unto *all* men. Not only are we required by the same authority to love our neighbours as ourselves, but also to do good to them that hate us; and that difference in religious opinions, does not release us from this obligation, is evident from the command to the Jews—"the *stranger* that dwelleth with you, shall be as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." Had these *liberal* sentiments been advanced by an advocate for Bible Societies, I fear you would have regarded them as indicative of his "indolent indifference" for "the distinctive principles" of the Church. But suffer me to inquire in what manner we are to fulfil the spirit of these precepts, in conformity with the qualification you would attach to them, in reference to the immense multitude around us, who cannot, by any efforts of ours, be made instrumental in advancing the Episcopal Church? We may, indeed, say to them, be ye warmed and filled; but what will it profit?

A practical illustration of your doctrine, was some time since exhibited in this city. Of all classes of society, that of seamen appeared to be the most hopelessly destitute, of "all that can bless the life that now is, or shed a cheering radiance on that which is to come." Condemned by their profession, to be the sport of the elements, and to face death in its most appalling forms, they were with few exceptions, ignorant of that Being who can control the one, and disarm the other of its terrors. To them the language of prayer and of thanksgiving, were alike unknown. When the dangers of the sea were past, and they found in port a short respite from their toils and perils, no temple witnessed their tribute of praise to Him, who holdeth the winds in his fist—No ambassador of heaven seized the transient moment, to de-

ive rto them his message of mercy. Equally unconscious of all the sweet charities of domestic life, and of all the awful realities and transcendent consolations of religious truth, they plunged into the haunts of infamy and pollution, and squandered in brutal riot, the avails of their labours and sufferings. When age or disease compelled them to abandon their profession, they were thrown wretched and forlorn upon the world; and frequently lingered out their miserable existence on foreign shores, dependant for their daily sustenance on the bounty of strangers. As their conflict with their last enemy approached, no friendly hand withdrew the dark veil which hid from their view, another and a better world—No man cared for their souls; and as they had lived without God, they died without hope.

At length, the Christian sympathy of some of our citizens was awakened in their behalf; and on the 29th of May, 1818, at a meeting of "merchants and others connected with the commerce of New-York," it was declared to be expedient to erect a house of worship for the gratuitous accommodation of seamen, to be styled "the Mariners' Church." The congregation which it was expected would be assembled in this Church, would of necessity be as fluctuating as the waves themselves; and the preacher would seldom address the same individuals more than once or twice. It was therefore futile to expect that men whose home was on the deep, could generally be organized into a regular church, and formally subjected, to the discipline of any denomination in particular. Of course, it was not to be presumed that any denomination would singly assume the burthen of erecting a Mariners' Church; and it was obvious that such a Church could only be built by the joint contributions of the pious and liberal. Accordingly, a society was formed, without reference to sectarian distinctions; and an appeal was made to the religious public, for the means of erecting a Church for the *gratuitous* and *exclusive* accommodation of sailors. The appeal was heard and answered, and a Mariners' Church, under the direction of the Society, and not of any ecclesiastical judicatory, has been built, and through the blessing of Providence, has been instrumental in doing great and extensive good. One would have thought that, the very proposal to build a temple, in which this most forlorn and neglected class of our fellow-citizens might be instructed in the things which belong to their eternal peace, "addressed to the understanding, an argument which could not be encountered; and to the heart, an appeal, which its holiest emotions would rise up and second." But no—a certain individual, fully impressed with a sense of the duty

of bending *all* our efforts to the advancement of our own Church, thought proper, three times* to exhort the Episcopalians of our city, in the public newspapers, not to subscribe to the Mariners' Church, because it would not be under Episcopal "superintendence;" nor would the prayer-book be used in it. In short, we should not assist in making sailors Christians, unless we can also make them Episcopalians. Of course, it would, except on the condition of advancing our Church, be equally sinful to assist in translating the scriptures, or in giving them to persons of other countries and other communions!

If, Sir, the doctrine that no money must be spent, no effort made, no labour undertaken, to promote the spiritual welfare of others, unless with an eye to the aggrandizement of the Church, should be generally embraced by our Bishops and Clergy; might not our enemies, with some appearance of justice, apply to our Church the words of the Prophet, "Her watchmen are all greedy dogs" "which can never have enough; they all look to their own way."

Whatever may be thought of this argument of yours against Bible Societies, it cannot be denied the merit of originality. It is a weapon of American fabrication, and will be sought for in vain, in the armory of the opponents of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Dr. MARSH, the ablest, and what is no mean praise, one of the most decent of the assailants of that Society, thus expresses himself with respect to its foreign operations, and unequivocally evinces his utter ignorance of the duty of bending *all* our efforts for the advancement of our own Church. "The Liturgy of our Church has no concern with the distribution of Bibles, where Christianity is professed under a different form. *Neither duty nor interest* require us in this case to do more than distribute the Bible. For this purpose I would gladly offer the right-hand of fellowship, not only to Protestants of every description, but to *Members of all other Churches, dispersed throughout the world*. For this purpose we should all, as Christians, engage on equal terms, being concerned alike with the distribution of the Scriptures; being alike desirous of promoting the general cause of Christianity, we should act on a principle which was common to all."

* See N. Y. Evening-Post, 6th June and 12th December, 1818, and 13th January, 1819.

“ In a Society composed of churchmen and dissenters, for the sole purpose of circulating the Scriptures in *foreign countries*, “ I would readily and heartily partake.” *Inquiry into the consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer-Book with the Bible.*—pp. 29, 75.

The next striking position in your charge is, “ that for the propagation of the Christian faith, by whatever particular mode, “ *we should associate only among ourselves*, and exclusively under “ the guardianship and authority of our own Church.” The general and unqualified terms in which you here express yourself, would entitle me to apply this maxim to the union of Episcopalians with others, in orphan asylums, in schools for the deaf and dumb, in Magdalen hospitals, and various other benevolent establishments in which the propagation of the Christian faith, or in other words, the religious instruction of those who are the subjects of the charity, forms a prominent object of the institution. I am willing, however, to understand your remark in the extensive sense in which you probably used it ; and here I cannot but congratulate myself, on being relieved from any further discussion on this point, by the authority of so distinguished an *Ultra* in the Church as the Bishop of Peterborough ; an authority which you, I am certain, will regard with the greatest deference. We have seen above, that for the propagation of the Christian faith, or, as he expresses it, the “ promoting the general cause of Christianity,” by the distribution of the Scriptures in other countries, he is willing to associate, not only with churchmen, not only with dissenters, but with the members of any and every Church throughout the world. Leaving, therefore, to so able and elevated an ally the task of vindicating Episcopalians, for not associating “ exclusively” among themselves, and under the authority of their own Church, for the propagation of the Christian faith, I proceed to the consideration of the heavy and momentous accusation adduced by you, against Bible Societies.

You inform the Convention, that these Societies seem to you, “ erroneous in the principle on which, in order to secure general “ co-operation they are founded—the *separation of the Church “ from the word of God*—the sacred volume, from the ministry, “ the worship, and the ordinances which it enjoins, as of divine institution, and the instruments of the propagation and preserva-

tion of Gospel truth.” Awful, indeed, Sir, must be the responsibility of those, who with sacrilegious hands presume to separate the Church from the word of God : but the persons upon whom this crime is chargeable, are to be found not among the members, but the *enemies* of Bible Societies. Our articles inform us, that “ the visible Church of Christ, is a congregation of faithful men,” &c. Now the word of God may be separated from this “ congregation,” or the individuals composing it, either directly, by interdicting them its use ; or indirectly, by representing it as not designed by its divine Author for indiscriminate perusal—as far above the comprehension of the illiterate, without the aid of a human commentary ; or lastly, by recommending some other book, as better “ calculated” for religious instruction ; and thus undervaluing the importance, and discouraging the study, of the inspired volume.

Our Homilies declare, that Satan, “ hath always stirred up in “ one place or other, cruel tyrants, sharp persecutors, and extreme “ enemies unto God and his infallible truth, to pull with violence, “ the Holy Bible out of the people’s hand.” But although we have no reason in the present age, and in Protestant countries, to apprehend a *violent* separation of the word and the Church of God by these instruments of Satan ; yet it cannot be concealed that there are persons who seem desirous to effect this purpose by the indirect means I have mentioned. It is to persons of this description, that our Homilies refer, when they speak of some who “ *pretend* that the difficulty to understand it” (the Bible) “ and the “ hardness thereof, is so great, that it is meet to be read only by “ clerks and learned men,” and again when they say, “ Not to know “ the Scriptures is to be ignorant of Christ, yet notwithstanding “ this, some there be, that think it not meet for all sorts of men to “ read the Scriptures, because they are, as they think, in sundry “ places, stumbling blocks to the unlearned.” In opposition to such opinions they declare that “ the effect and virtue of God’s “ word is to *illuminate the ignorant* ;” that “ there is no truth nor “ doctrine necessary for our salvation, but that is, or may be “ drawn out of that fountain and well of truth.”

It would indeed be extraordinary, should the members of Bible Societies, whose vocation it is to distribute Bibles, be found endeavouring to separate the word of God from his Church ; but no

less extraordinary must it seem, that ministers of the Gospel,—dignitaries of Protestant Churches, should be engaged in such an undertaking. But alas, Sir, however extraordinary and humiliating may be the fact, still it is but too true that such ministers and such dignitaries are to be found; but I rejoice, that they will be looked for in vain among the supporters of Bible Societies.

The Rev. Dr. Edward Maltby, Prebendary of Lincoln, sometime since published a work in opposition to the British and Foreign Bible Society.* He objects to that institution because they distribute the *whole* Bible. “The *whole* of the Bible” he contends is neither “necessary” nor “could be intended for the use of all classes of mankind.” “Some of these books” (of the Old and New Testaments) “are,” he declares, “exclusively fit for the meditation of the learned; and others though comparatively forming a small portion are equally important to the vulgar, and to the well informed.” “Out of sixty-six books which form the contents of the Old and New Testaments, not above *seven* in the Old, nor above *eleven* in the New, appear to be calculated for the study, or comprehension of the unlearned.” “Mankind ought no more to expect to understand the prophecies of Ezekiel, or the epistles of St. Paul, than the tragedies of Æschylus, or the letters of Cicero or Pliny!!”

Another of these enemies to our Church, who are trying to separate from her the Word of God, is the Rev. Mr. O’Callaghan. This gentleman asserts, that “the Bible, without note or comment, is unfit for the perusal of the rude and illiterate;” that it is “one of the most difficult books he ever read; and that this character was applicable, though in different degrees, to *every part of it, not purely historical* ;” and he is convinced “that God, for the wisest purposes, *intended*, that the book of our salvation should be difficult in proportion to its value.” “The natural effect on the uncultivated mind, of reading the Bible without note or comment, oral or written, is enthusiasm, more or less sublimated according to the temperament of the individual.” The supposition that “the contracted mind of an ignorant peasant” can “comprehend in *any tolerable degree* the high import of these sublime and

* Thoughts on the utility and expediency of the plans proposed by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

“sacred books” he declares “to be not only unfounded but mischievous.”*

This Irish clergyman, who through some blunder, has found his way into the Established, instead of the Romish Church, far from being a friend to Bible Societies, has attacked them with a malignity and scurrility not unworthy a Norris. The supporters of these institutions, are held up by this man, to public derision and detestation as “saints”—“spiritual jacobins”,—more formidable than “the secret tribunal of Westphalia”—“the illuminati of Germany”—“the jacobin club;” and “the Irish executive directory;” and he declares it to be “the duty of the state, to dissolve the dangerous confederacy.”† Could any thing connected with such awful heresies and blasphemies, provoke a smile, it would be the recommendation of this Irish master of a college, to the *state*, to dissolve a confederacy, embracing the king’s ministers, the royal family, and the heir apparent to the throne.

The Prebendary of Lincoln we have seen, admits that there are *eighteen* of the sixty-six books of Scripture, equally important to the learned and unlearned; and for the sake of *these*, the poor and ignorant might wish to have the Bible, although incumbered with so much useless matter: and as Mr. O’Callaghan has not condescended to point out to them any other book to which they can resort, for the words of eternal life, they may still desire to possess the sacred volume, trusting to their own diligence, and divine assistance, to understand some little portion of it. One more effort, therefore, was necessary, to effect the complete separation of the Word and the Church of God. A *substitute* for the Bible, was to be found, and this task, too hazardous for even Mr. O’Callaghan to attempt, has been fearlessly executed by an American Bishop.

In a Pastoral letter condemning Bible Societies, which you, Sir, addressed to the Laity of our Church in this Diocess, on the 3d of April, 1815, I find the following. “In distributing the Book of Common-Prayer, we circulate the most interesting and valuable passages of Scripture, lucidly and appositely arranged, so as to present not a

* “Thoughts on the tendency of Bible Societies as affecting the established religion, and Christianity, as a reasonable service”—by the Rev. A. O’Callaghan, master of Kilkenny college.

† “The Bible Society against the State and Church,” by the Rev. A. O’Callaghan.

“*perverted or imperfect view*, of divine truth, but in simplicity and
 “force the fundamental principles and privileges of the great charter
 “of our salvation. It is not hazarding too much to assert, that he who
 “will read the *portions* of sacred writ contained in the Book of Com-
 “mon Prayer and in the offices usually connected with it, will be-
 “come acquainted with *every part of Scripture* arranged in per-
 “spicuous and impressive order, *which can be necessary to form his*
 “*faith, to regulate his obedience, to inspire his hopes. and to guide his*
 “*devotions.* We distribute then the *Holy Scriptures* in the manner
 “*best calculated to diffuse a knowledge of their sacred contents,*
 “when we distribute the *Book of Common Prayer.*”

I have diligently studied the passage now quoted ; and carefully weighed each word and sentence, to extract from it, if possible, a different meaning than that which it naturally bears ; but after examining it, with a most sincere desire to understand it, in no other sense than you intended it to be understood ; I am constrained to infer from it ; that in your opinion, there is no part of Scripture, which can be necessary to form a Christian’s faith, regulate his obedience, inspire his hopes, or guide his devotions, which is not contained in the Prayer Book ; and also, that the knowledge of Scripture, will be more promoted by the distribution of the Prayer Book, than of the Bible itself. It is also I think intimated, although not expressly asserted, that the Bible presents a *perverted or imperfect view* of divine truth ; because you tell us, that in the Prayer Book, the extracts from the Bible are so arranged, as *not* to present such a view.

I had been led by high authority to believe, not only that “all Scripture” was given by inspiration of God, but that it was *all* “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction “in righteousness.” But it now seems that you have detected much *unnecessary* matter in the sacred volume. The quantity of this matter, may be ascertained by comparing the extracts in the Prayer Book, with the *whole* contents of the Bible. Such a comparison carefully made, presents us with the following portions of Scripture, *not contained* “in the Book of Common Prayer and in the offices “usually connected with it,” and of course according to the Pastoral Letter *not necessary* to form our faith, regulate our obedience, inspire our hopes, or guide our devotions : consequently, having but little influence on our conduct here, or our happiness hereafter, viz. In the Old Testament—The book of Genesis. 39 chapters

of Exodus, the books of Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 & 2 Samuel, 1 & 2 Kings, 1 & 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, 40 chapters of Job, 30 chapters of Proverbs, the books of Ecclesiastes and Canticles, 63 chapters of Isaiah, 51 chapters of Jeremiah, the book of Lamentations, 47 chapters of Ezekiel, 11 chapters of Daniel, the book of Hosea, 2 chapters of Joel, the books of Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, 2 chapters of Habakkuk, the books of Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, 2 chapters of Malachi.

In the New Testament—7 chapters of St. Matthew, 11 chapters of St. Mark, 5 chapters of St. Luke, 7 chapters of St. John, 17 chapters of Acts, 9 chapters of Romans, 9 chapters of 1 Corinthians, 6 chapters of 2 Corinthians, 2 chapters of Galatians, 1 chapter of Ephesians, 2 chapters of Colossians, 4 chapters of 1 Thessalonians, the whole of 2 Thessalonians, 3 chapters of 1 Timothy, 3 chapters of 2 Timothy, the whole of Titus and Philemon, 7 chapters of Hebrews, 4 chapters of James, 2 chapters of 1 Peter, the whole of 2 Peter, 2 chapters of 1 John, the whole of 2 and 3 John, and 18 chapters of Revelation.

But let it not be supposed, that the Prayer Book contains all the residue of Scripture. There cannot be found in it, with the exception of the Psalms, but six entire chapters,* and the remaining extracts consist of detached passages and fragments of chapters. In some instances, a single verse only is given from a whole book, as is the case from Hab. Joel, and Proverbs.

Thus, Sir, we have seen, that the offence of separating the Word and the Church of God, which you have thought proper to charge upon Bible Societies, has been attempted by very different instruments; and should you succeed in convincing Episcopalians, that the Prayer Book contains all the Scripture that is necessary, and that it is better calculated to convey a knowledge of Scriptural truth, than the Bible itself, the attempt would in time be crowned with complete success. Yes Sir, let the sufficiency of the Prayer Book as a substitute for the Bible be generally believed, and the latter would soon be consigned exclusively to the shelves of the learned and curious; and the poor and illiterate of our congregations would be told like the Catholics, that the command of the

* 1 Cor. xiii. Isaiah lxiii. Mark xiv. Luke xxii. 1 John i. Rev. iv.

Redeemer, "Search the Scriptures," did not apply to *them*; and that the Church had kindly provided for their use, a *little Bible*, which although not the twentieth part of the size of that Bible indited by inspiration, nevertheless contained all that was necessary to form their faith, regulate their obedience, inspire their hopes, and guide their devotions!

I will not affect to believe, that the sense in which I have considered your expression, "the separation of the Church from the Word of God;" although the only one I am confident, which it will rationally bear, is the one in which you used it. The meaning which you attach to these words, and their application to Bible Societies, will be examined in connexion with another part of your charge. I will also postpone for the present, the consideration of your assertion, that these institutions "tend to weaken the zeal of Episcopalians in favour of those distinguishing principles of their Church, which eminently entitle her, to the appellation of apostolic and primitive;" and hasten to your insinuation, that the success which has attended Bible Societies is not to be regarded "as evidence of the favour of Heaven," because "heretical and schismatical sects have at various times obtained great popularity," &c.

I cannot but regard this remark as intended to rebut the argument of Governor Jay, in his late address to the American Bible Society, that the peculiar circumstances under which Bible Societies originated; the wonderful extension which has been given to them; the unanimity with which conflicting sects have supported them; and the events which have occurred to facilitate the distribution of the Scriptures, all unite to induce the belief, that these institutions, together with the other means which are now hastening the coming in of the Gentiles, are *providential*; and under this persuasion he recommends to the opponents of Bible Societies, the counsel of Gamaliel.

No one, I believe, in the possession of his faculties, ever contended that the mere success of an undertaking, of itself, indicated the divine approbation; and he who labours to disprove so wild an opinion, is but as one who beateth the air. But when we observe an institution established in the midst of war and desolation, devoted solely to the glory of God, and the salvation of man: when its propriety and utility is so obvious, that the wise and good, the

excellent of the earth, however much they may differ on other points, lend it their unanimous sanction ; when expiring saints rejoice that they have been permitted to labour in its service ; when Christian nations, with the single exception of such as are involved in the gloom of papal ignorance and superstition ; as if animated by one heart and one mind, are yielding to it, their treasures and their exertions ; and when in consequence of this institution, the Gospel has free course and is glorified, in a degree unparalleled since the days of the Apostles : surely, Sir, we may be permitted to say, “ it is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes,” without being classed with the most ignorant of fanatics.

“ Thirty-six most respectable men composed, in 1804, the committee of this infant association—and now, all the North of Europe, almost the whole of Germany, the vast empire of Russia, the United States, the English Colonies in both worlds, the shores of Africa, and the remote isles of the East, are covered with Societies employed in distributing the sacred Manna! The tribes of the Esquimaux, the followers of Mahomet, the descendants of the ancient Hindoos, even the followers of Confucius, now read the Holy Scriptures, and begin to do homage to the truth! Surely if no enterprise, truly grand and glorious, can ever be executed, if no good design can even be put into the heart, or accomplished by the hands of men, without assistance from on High, here is a case in which we may say, *THIS IS THE FINGER OF GOD.*”*

Having exhausted the resources of argument, you finally call to your aid, the authority, not of your own, but of a foreign church ; and congratulate yourself, that in withholding your support from Bible Societies, you are acting—not with the House of Bishops, of which you are a member—but with the Lord Bishops of England and Ireland.

Although the friends of these Societies, believe that in making known to the poor and ignorant the unsearchable riches of Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures, they are engaged in a work of faith, and labour of love, and cannot, and ought not to abandon this work through fear of incurring the frowns, even of those who occupy “ the highest stations in the Church ;” yet sincerely do they re-

* Preface to French translation of Owen’s History of B. & F. Bible Society, by the Rev. Mr. Peschier, Pastor, and Professor of Belles Lettres, at Geneva.

joice when they find themselves "perfectly joined together in the same mind, and the same judgment," with those whose learning, talents, and piety, give weight to their opinions, and influence to their example.

But before we proceed to inquire whether you are, in fact, acting as you seem to suppose, in unison with episcopal authority abroad ; we may perhaps render a not unimportant service to the younger clergy especially, by ascertaining what degree of submission is due from them to episcopal authority at home, when that authority is exercised to deter them from uniting with their fellow Christians in publishing, through the medium of the Scriptures, the words of eternal life. This investigation will not be deemed impertinent, when we recollect that many of your Presbyters have unequivocally regretted and condemned the cause you have pursued with regard to Bible Societies, while, at the same time, they contended that the obedience they owed their Bishop, required them to act in conformity with his recommendations, although contrary to their own judgments. Accordingly there have been instances of clergymen, who, while they remained in this Diocess, could not be persuaded to join Bible Societies ; on removing to Pennsylvania and Maryland, immediately took an active part in their management. It cannot therefore, be unimportant to inquire whether a clergyman, who conscientiously believes that these institutions are calculated to advance the temporal and eternal welfare of his fellow men, is in any case restrained by his ordination vows, or by the respect he owes his Diocesan, from giving them his support and countenance.

It will not be denied, that there can be no obligation to obey where there is no right to command. A Bishop can derive a right to forbid his clergy to unite in Bible Societies, only from Scripture, or from the constitution and canons of the Church. It will not be attempted to deduce his right from the former source ; and, it would be equally in vain to seek for it in the latter. The Bishop, at his consecration, is indeed commanded "diligently to exercise discipline," and to "drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine." But the discipline which he is to exercise is such only "as by the authority of God's word, and by the order of the Church, is committed" to him ; and the "erroneous and strange doctrine" is such only as is "contrary to God's word."

It is therefore obvious, that the right of exercising discipline, is not an arbitrary and undefined right ; and that unless the discipline of the Church, as established by her canons, or God's word, forbids Episcopalians to unite in these associations, the Bishop cannot derive a right to forbid them from the consecration service. It is true that Priests and Deacons at their ordination, promise to obey their Bishops, and other chief ministers, " who, according to the canons of the Church, have the charge and government over them ;" and they also promise to follow, with a glad mind and will, " their *godly* admonitions ;" but a much higher authority forbids them to fear man rather than God, and of course, when they esteem the admonitions of their Bishop to be ungodly, they are under the most solemn obligations to disregard them. Such of your clergy Sir, as are in this particular, disregarding your monitions, may share with you " the satisfaction" of acting with those in high stations, " in the Church from which we are descended."

A charge against Bible Societies from his Diocesan, called forth a letter from the able and justly celebrated pen of Mr. Gisborne, addressed to the Bishop of Gloucester. " I have heard a doubt expressed," says this truly pious and respectable divine, " whether " a clergyman of the Church of England, having solemnly promised " at his ordination, that he will reverently obey his ordinary and " and other chief ministers unto whom is committed the charge " and government over him ; following with a glad mind and will " their godly admonitions, and submitting himself to their godly " judgments ;" is not by that engagement bound to withdraw himself from the Bible Society, or " to abstain from joining it, if duly " apprized that his diocesan disapproves the society. I think it " manifest, that in conformity with the general rules recognised in " the interpretation of enactments of the Legislature, the obedience " required and promised in the ordination service, relates exclusively to the office then to be conferred by the Bishop, and received by the applicant for holy orders ; the office of a minister " of the Church of England ; or in other words, to the discharge " of clerical duties publicly in the Church, or in private ministrations, visits and parochial superintendence, and any other specified points of conduct. As the supporting of Bible Societies is " one of the points on which the promises made at the time of or-

“dination had no prospective bearing, *the clergyman is at liberty to act on that subject, whatever be the sentiments of his diocesan, as he judges most conducive to the glory of God: and in the sight of God, he is bound so to act.*”

Suffer me to adduce a still higher authority than Mr. Gisborne,—the present Bishop of Gloucester—This prelate, when Dean of Wells, was invited to co-operate in the formation of the Somerset Auxiliary Bible Society, his diocesan having discountenanced the measure. The invitation was promptly accepted, and in his letter to the committee, the Dean, alluding to the opposition of his Bishop, remarks, “I must add, that I cannot but feel regret in differing on this occasion from the opinions, and declining to follow the example of those for whom on every account I entertain so much regard, but I cannot (and should not I am sure be expected to) allow that regret to overcome the conviction of my own judgment and *the dictate as I conceive of my conscience.*”

But to dissipate at once every doubt on the subject, I offer the following disclaimer on the part of the Episcopate itself, of all dominion over the consciences of the clergy. The Bishop of Ely in a charge to his clergy, after expressing his disapprobation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and giving his reasons why he could not join it, adds, “Although I have thus explained to you my sentiments on the subject of the Bible Society, I by no means expect that any implicit deference should be paid to my opinion. This is a point on which good men have been much divided in their opinion, *and every one must decide according to the dictate of his own conscience.*”

I am far from imputing to you, Sir, the assumption of a right to dictate to your clergy, I am sure you regret with me, that any of them should so far mistake their obligations as Christians and as Churchmen, as to abstain from Bible Societies contrary to their own judgment, solely from deference to your opinion.

I will now proceed to consider, how far your opposition to Bible Societies, is sanctioned by Episcopal example. As I am about to enter a wide field of investigation, a field which it is not my purpose, lightly to examine, I must offer as an apology for the weariness you will probably experience in keeping me company while exploring it, the imposing exhibition presented in your charge, of

forty-five right reverend Bishops drawn up in battle array against the British and Foreign Bible Society, while only ten of these dignified personages, are seen in the opposite ranks.

I was taught, Sir, in my childhood, that many objects which when indistinctly seen at a distance, and through the medium of an alarmed imagination, assume most terrific shapes, prove on near inspection to be perfectly harmless. The truth of this precept of the nursery, has been fully exemplified in the present instance ; for on reconnoitering my supposed foes, my fears have gradually subsided, till at last they have been exchanged for confidence ; and I have discovered in the English and Irish Episcopate, my firmest and most efficient friends and allies. On taking a nearer view of these forty-five Prelates, I observed, that they were not, as to a superficial reader of your charge they would undoubtedly appear, *opponents* of the British and Foreign Bible Society ; but that you had merely stated, with a cautious selection of language, that their names “ do not appear among the supporters ” of that institution. On this, I began to take courage. I recollected that it could not be a necessary consequence, that all who did not belong to a religious society, were opposed to it ; for in that case, it would seem that the great body of Episcopalians in this city are *opposed* to the Bible and Prayer Book Society ; as their late report informs us, their patronage is extremely limited. I recollected also, that the English Society for promoting Christian Knowledge ; a society of ancient date, peculiarly connected with the established Church, and to which it is not known, that any opposition whatever exists, so late as 1812, numbered only 32 Episcopal patrons of the 49 bishops of the established Church ; and that comparatively, only a few Bishops at this moment belong to the Prayer Book and Homily Society ; the Church Missionary Society ; the Church of England Tract Society ; or the Society for converting the Jews ; although they are all under the exclusive control of members of the established Church. It is believed that of the American Bishops, the names of Bishops White and Kemp, are alone to be found, among the “ supporters ” of the American Colonization Society, and yet I presume that neither you, nor the rest of your brethren would be willing to admit, that this circumstance afforded any proof of the hostility of the American Bishops to that institution. It likewise occurred to me, that there were certain reasons which

might influence many of the English Prelates to decline a connexion with the British and Foreign Bible Society, who at the same time, were by no means opposed to the principles on which it is founded. The Christian Knowledge Society, established long prior to the Bible Society is, as I have already remarked. intimately connected with the Established Church, and disseminates the Scriptures to a very great extent, as well as Prayer Books and episcopal tracts. It is therefore very possible, that some of the Bishops may think this institution entitled to their *exclusive* patronage, who, had not this Society existed, would cheerfully have given their countenance to the Bible Society. This opinion is, in a great measure, confirmed by a charge of the present Bishop of Gloucester, a warm and active friend of the Bible Society ; in which, after recommending this Society to his Clergy, he tells them, that in case their circumstances are so contracted, as not to permit them to subscribe to *both* Societies, he thinks the Christian Knowledge Society entitled to their single subscription. It is certainly fair then, to presume, that if a Prelate so much attached to the Bible cause as the Bishop of Gloucester, still admits, that when both cannot be patronised, the Christian Knowledge Society ought to be preferred, that many other Bishops may go a little further, and contend, that this Society ought to be *exclusively* patronised by churchmen, without entertaining an unfriendly feeling towards the Bible Society, or dreaming that its members are separating "the Word and the Church of God."

But although there is no evidence that the forty-five Bishops you have named, are *opposed* to Bible Societies ; yet it is a lamentable truth, that a *few* of the Bishops of the established Church, have arrayed themselves against the British and Foreign Bible Society. But here again my apprehensions have been wonderfully relieved by a close examination of the nature and extent of their hostility. This institution was established in 1804, and after the most diligent researches into its history, I cannot find, that a single Bishop in the United Kingdoms uttered a syllable against it, till 1810. In that year the Bishop of London, I believe Dr. Randolph, was invited to accept the presidency of an Auxiliary Society. The invitation was declined on account of his objections to the Society ; but not having seen his letter on the occasion, I am ignorant of their nature.

In 1812, a similar invitation was given to the late Bishop of Gloucester, who likewise declined it, but instead of grounding his refusal on the erroneous principles of the Society, he merely stated, that there were already, the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and that for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts, and that in his opinion, “ these two Societies have claims on the
“ clergy of the Establishment, for all the pecuniary aid, and men-
“ tal exertion which can possibly be contributed by them, in sup-
“ port of those ancient and chartered Societies.”

From this time to 1814, no Episcopal voice was raised in opposition to the Society ; but in this year, the Bishop of Chester delivered a charge in which, to the utter confusion of the O’Callaghan’s, the Norrisses, *et id genus omne*, who had calumniated the motives and designs of the friends of the Society, he thus expresses himself : “ From my heart, I believe, that as a
“ body, they are actuated by no other incitement than a wish to
“ promote the present and eternal happiness of their fellow crea-
“ tures.” The Bishop however, declares his disapprobation of the Society, and concludes with assuring his clergy, “ It is my de-
“ cided conviction, that by joining the Bible Society, you may,
“ though unintentionally, endanger the interests of the Church
“ and State.” The next year, the Bishop of Lincoln delivered a charge, in which he is reported to have said, that the Bible Society was “ dangerous to the established religion, and the orthodox
“ principles of those who attended its meetings, as it admits mem-
“ bers of any creed or no creed.” That it was, “ as absurd and
“ unaccountable for those who pray against false doctrine, heresy
“ and schism, to join in religious associations with those who avow
“ the falsest doctrines and most notorious heresies, and most de-
“ termined schism, as to see loyal Britons joining themselves with,
“ and furnishing arms to the excitors of sedition, abettors of privy
“ conspiracy, and promoters of sedition.” You will observe Sir, that I say the Bishop is *reported* to have uttered these extraordinary sentiments ; for he had the good sense to refuse every solicitation to print his charge. In 1816, the Bishop of Carlisle, in a charge to his clergy, laboured to prove the principles of Bible Societies to be erroneous, and declared that he did not think
“ they were calculated to promote our ecclesiastical establish-
“ ment, or the quiet of it.”

The next instance of episcopal opposition, was the temperate and dignified charge of the Bishop of Ely, from which we have already given an extract ; and the next, and as far as my information extends, the *last* Bishop of the established Church, who has opposed the British and Foreign Bible Society, is Dr. Marsh.* This gentleman, when Bishop of Landaff, 1817, in a charge to his clergy, speaking of the Christian Knowledge Society, observed, “ It is the most ancient Bible Society in this kingdom ; its title is “ well adapted to its object, for Christian knowledge is unquestion- “ ably promoted by the circulation of the Bible.” He then states his preference for this Society, because it gives the Prayer Book, and remarks, “ Though the use of the Bible makes us Chris- “ tians, it is the use of the Prayer Book also which makes us “ Churchmen.”

You will not I hope Sir, from the foregoing summary of the Episcopal opposition in Great Britain, conclude that I am ignorant of the recent occurrences in Ireland, connected with the Hibernian Bible Society. Far from wishing to conceal them, I am anxious they should be known, because they afford a salutary lesson to all the conductors of Bible Societies. This institution till lately enjoyed almost the unanimous patronage of the Irish Episcopate ; and the recent loss of a portion of that patronage, is to be imputed not to any dissatisfaction of the Irish prelates with the *principles* on which it was founded, but to a slight deviation from those principles on the part of the Society itself. Two of the Irish Archbishops, after having for years held offices in this Society, lately withdrew from it, and some of the Bishops have followed their example. It would indeed have been an awkward confession for these Archbishops to have made, that they had for years been guilty of separating “ God’s Word and God’s Church.” It would have added but little to their dignity, and the weight of their exam-

* I do not mean to assert, that no other than the Bishops I have named, have opposed Bible Societies, because it is possible, that some instances have escaped my inquiries ; but the foregoing cases are all I have been able to discover, after an industrious investigation of the first fifteen years of the history of the Society by Owen, and of every document relating to the subject which I have been able to procure. Neither do I mean to assert, that all the Bishops approve of the Society, who have not opposed it ; because it is very possible, that some who disapprove of it, may be restrained by their respect for the opinions of others, and their regard for the peace of the Church, from openly condemning it.

ple, to have admitted, that it was not till long after their elevation to the highest stations in the Church, that they had made the discovery, that the Bible was unintelligible without the aid of human commentaries, and that in giving to the destitute the words of eternal life, they had sanctioned a "departure from the apostolic mode of propagating Christianity." Nor do I find that such extraordinary and humiliating confessions have been made. I have before me, the letter of the late Primate of Ireland, requiring his name to be withdrawn from the Society; and in this letter he declares himself "a friend to the circulation of the Scriptures;" and expresses the reluctance and even *pain* he feels on leaving the Society. He then assigns as his reasons, the change which he thinks has been made in the constitution of the Society; and the improper topics and expressions introduced in the speeches delivered at its public meetings.

What stronger evidence can we require than this very letter, of the Primate's approbation of the *principles* of Bible Societies? Are we not expressly given to understand, that had not the constitution been changed, and had no improprieties occurred at the public meetings, he would gladly have continued his patronage to the Society. We have every reason for believing that the reasons assigned by the Primate, are the same which influenced the other Bishops who seceded from the Irish Society; and yet their names are included in the forty-five, who you inform us do not support the British and Foreign Bible Society.

From certain facts which have come to my knowledge, I am inclined to believe that there were some grounds for the Primate's complaints, although not to the extent he seems to have supposed; and that the Hibernian Society had been guilty of some indiscretions, arising rather from that ardency of feeling so peculiar to the Irish character, than from any intention to violate the fundamental principles of the Society; and I cannot but attribute to the same ardency of feeling, the hasty step of the Primate in withdrawing from the Society, without first interposing his authority and influence to correct the errors which offended him. Several of the Irish Bishops belong to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and from that institution, it is not known that any Bishop has ever withdrawn his name.

I have thus, Sir, candidly and honestly, stated *every* instance of opposition to Bible Societies on the part of the English, Irish and

Scotch Bishops, with which I am acquainted, from the period of their first establishment to the present time. And now Sir, to what a little insignificant band, is your formidable array of forty-five Bishops reduced? Of fifty-five Bishops, we find two, (both since deceased) who on being *invited* to accept offices in Auxiliary Societies, decline the intended honour; and one of these, instead of disapproving of the principles of the Bible Society contents himself with expressing his *preference* for those Societies which are immediately connected with the establishment; and we find *five* who in their charges object to the Society and advise their clergy not to join it. Of these, one refuses to print his charge—another tells his clergy, that it is a question on which good men differ, and that they must act according to the dictates of their own consciences, and a third, the present Bishop of Peterborough, in pointed terms approves of the union of Christians for the diffusion of the Scriptures, without note or comment, wherever Christianity is professed under a form different from the established Church; declaring that the circulation of the Bible unquestionably promotes Christian knowledge, and that the use of it makes men Christians.

We are now Sir, prepared to judge how far in *opposing* Bible Societies, you are acting “with those in the highest stations of the Church from which we are descended;” and how far the nature of your hostility is sanctioned by their example.

Spontaneously, and without the slightest provocation, you have attacked Bible Societies in the public newspapers, giving to your accusations against them, the sanction of your name, and of the sacred office you bear.* You have attacked Bible Societies, in a pastoral letter, addressed to the laity of your Diocese.† You have attacked Bible Societies, in an address before another institution,‡ and you have now recently attacked them in your charge to the Convention.

Indeed Sir, your opposition to Bible Societies, although always free from offensive personalities, evinces nevertheless, an inveteracy, a restlessness, a perseverance, wholly unknown to the Prelates with whom you suppose you are acting.

* See New-York Evening Post, May 13th, 1816.

† See Pastoral Letter of 3d April, 1815.

‡ See address before New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer-Book Society; delivered 8th March, 1816.

Having thus Sir, reconnoitered our enemies, and having found them far less formidable than your representations would lead us to imagine; it is now time to take an account of our friends and allies; and I will accordingly proceed to number the Bishops of the established Church, who have, within the period I have been considering, borne their testimony in favour of Bible Societies. It is obvious that the principles of these associations, whether correct or otherwise, can in no degree be affected by the names by which they are distinguished. If it be wrong in Episcopalians to support the British and Foreign Bible Society, it must be equally wrong in them to support the Naval and Military Society, or the Hibernian Society, since they are all founded upon the same principle of universal co-operation, for the distribution of the uncommented Scriptures. It is this principle which you condemn; and in support of your opinion, you give us the names of forty-five Bishops who do not belong to the *British and Foreign Bible Society*. But if any of these Bishops belong to other Bible Societies, or have in any manner whatever declared their approbation of the very principle which you condemn, then Sir, you appeal to them in vain to sanction your hostility. You have not, it is true, asserted that these forty-five Bishops were *opposed* to Bible Societies, nor that they do not support them; but merely that their names “do not appear among the supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society.” Your prudence in selecting these precise terms is rendered peculiarly manifest, by the singular fact that the dignified name which is placed at the head of your array of the non-supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society, will likewise be found at the head of my list of the Episcopal patrons of Bible Societies. You cannot Sir, be ignorant that the Primate of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has for years been, and still is, at the head of the Naval and Military Bible Society, which does not in the least degree differ in principle from the British and Foreign Bible Society, but only in the more limited sphere of its operations. You are also probably aware, that many of the Irish Bishops were satisfied with patronising the Bible Society of their own country, and did not remit contributions to the British Society. Their secession from the Hibernian Society has already been noticed, and we have seen that it arose from the indiscretions of the Society, and not from any disapprobation of the Bishops with the principles on which it was professedly founded. Yet are the

names of some of these Bishops, who have for years been supporters of a Bible Society, included among the forty-five non-supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

As before remarked, the British and Foreign Bible Society was established in 1804, and within the period which has since elapsed, the following Prelates of the established Church, have united with their fellow Christians in distributing the Scriptures without note or comment; thus incurring according to the doctrines of your charge, the guilt of separating "the Church from the word of God."

*Patron of the Naval and Military Bible Society.**

The Archbishop of Canterbury.

Members and Officers of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Archbishop of Cashel	Bishop of Litchfield and
Archbishop of Tuam	Coventry
Bishop of Durham	———— Kildare
———— St. David's	———— Clogher
———— Salisbury	———— Derry
———— Norwich	———— Bristol
———— Gloucester	———— Landaff
———— Meath	———— London
———— Chichester	———— Clonfert
———— Soda and Man	———— Cloyne

Members and Officers of the Hibernian Bible Society.

Archbishop of Armagh, Pri-	Bishop of Raphoe
mate of Ireland	———— Limerick
Archbishop of Dublin	———— Ferns
Bishop of Kilmore	———— Killaloe
———— Down	———— Dromore
———— Elphin	———— Cork
———— Killala	

To the above should be added, the name of Dr. Warren, Bishop of Bangor, who, although he never, I believe, belonged to any Bible Society, yet instructed the rural Deans throughout his Diocese, to distribute the plans of the British and Foreign Bible Society,

* This institution was formed prior to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

and to solicit contributions to its funds ; a pretty strong proof that it is possible to refrain from joining a Society without being opposed to it. We thus find, that since 1804, *thirty-two* Bishops have openly supported Bible Societies, and *seven* have openly expressed their disapprobation of them. In 1815, a *majority* of the Bishops of the Established Church belonged to Bible Societies ; but the death of some, and the secession of others from the Hibernian Society, have reduced their number to a minority. But possibly it may be imagined, that the Bishops I have named have rather *acquiesced* in Bible Societies, than cordially approved of them ; and that their patronage has been merely nominal—To correct so erroneous a sentiment, if such be entertained, suffer me to call your attention to some extracts from their speeches and writings, from which we may learn their real opinions of the utility and propriety of these associations.

I know not, that I can introduce to your notice, any Prelate whose spotless character, and whose exalted piety and talents, have reflected more lustre upon the Church of which he was a member, than the Right Rev. Dr. Porteus, late Bishop of London. This estimable Prelate had the honour of being the first Episcopal patron of the British and Foreign Bible Society ; and of that institution he thus expressed himself :—" It is rising uniformly in reputation and credit ; gaining new accessions of strength and revenue ; and attaching to itself more and more the approbation and support of every real friend to the Church and to Religion." (See Hodgson's life.) He also condescended to publish a pamphlet in vindication of the Society's operations in India, under the signature of " A Member of the British and Foreign Bible Society."*

THE BISHOP OF BRISTOL, in 1810, addressed a circular letter to his Clergy, recommending the formation of an Auxiliary Bible Society in the city of Bristol.

THE BISHOP OF LEIGHLIN AND FERNS in a charge to his Clergy in 1812, after recommending the formation of an Auxiliary Society, says, " in aid and assistance of which, I trust I shall ever be found as forward as any of the Clergy can wish or expect ; convinced as I must be, that the object and views of these Societies are of the highest import and concernment ; that they tend to the welfare of every individual, as well as the community in general ; operating on the morals and well being of the rising generation,

* See Owen's History.

“and extending to affect the eternal interests of all who participate in the benefit of them.”

THE BISHOP OF KILDARE delivered a speech before the British and Foreign Bible Society, at its annual meeting in 1812.

THE BISHOP OF MEATH likewise delivered a speech on the same occasion, in which he is represented to have “expressed the warmest satisfaction at witnessing so numerous a meeting united thus cordially and ardently on an object of so much importance; and assured them, that he should endeavour to impart a similar impression to the Clergy of that Diocess which constituted the sphere of his labours.” *Ch. Observer, Vol. ii. 318.*

THE BISHOP OF CLOYNE, in 1813, attended at the formation of the North West London Auxiliary Society, and in his speech on that occasion observed, “That there should be learned and respectable men, and such men I am afraid are to be found, who object to our principle, and are alarmed at our progress, is to me matter of pure and simple astonishment.” In 1818, his Lordship attended the meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and in addressing the assembly, exhorted them to persevere in their labours, in the following terms: “Proceed in your exertions, Gentlemen; God will prosper them; and neither our enemies at home with all their pamphlets; nor the Pope himself with all his Bulls; nor the great Enemy of Mankind, with all his arts, will be able to prevail against us.”

THE BISHOP OF LANDAFF. “It” (the British and Foreign Bible Society,) “portends, I trust, the commencement of a new epoch in the history of the human kind, when the Christian religion shall be universally received, rightly understood, and conscientiously practised.” *Letter to Lord Teignmouth, 12th Oct. 1814.*

THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER. “I confess myself extremely gratified with the contents of the Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society and might have conceived (had I not heard the contrary) that no wellwisher to an extensive dissemination of the Gospel could fail of being so.” *Letter to Committee of B. and F. B. S., Aug. 14th, 1815.*

THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID’S, in 1813, in a charge to his Clergy, remarked, “The Bible Society undertakes to distribute the Bible: it confines itself to the Bible; but it neither obstructs nor discourages the circulation of the Common Prayer Book; for every member of the Society is at liberty to give the Prayer Book with

“ the Bible : but if the Society had refused to sell the Bible without
 “ the Prayer Book, it would certainly have obstructed the circu-
 “ lation of the Bible.”

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER, in a speech delivered before the British and Foreign Bible Society remarked, “ Opposition has been
 “ revived, but it has been ably and decisively defeated. Indeed facts
 “ begin now to speak. We find many examples of the practical results
 “ of disseminating the pure word of God. The circulation of the
 “ Prayer Book has not been lessened ; it has on the contrary
 “ *greatly increased* during the whole period since the formation of
 “ this Society. The other tendency which the friends of our So-
 “ ciety thought to be most probable, begins to appear. The ef-
 “ fects of the Bible are becoming daily more and more visible.
 “ And what are these effects ? The drunkard becomes sober ; the
 “ profligate chaste ; the swearer fears an oath. May the God of
 “ the Bible grant that this tendency may increase year by year.”

THE BISHOP OF NORWICH. “ The duties of my diocess im-
 “ periously call me to Norwich. Were it otherwise, old as I am,
 “ I should feel strongly inclined to make a last effort to be present
 “ at the anniversary of our glorious and interesting meeting ; for
 “ the purpose of bearing my dying testimony in favour of an in-
 “ stitution, which I am firmly persuaded *hath effected more spiri-
 “ tual good to mankind, than hath been achieved in the same time since
 “ the days of the Apostles.*” *Letter to Lord Teignmouth, 2 May,*
 1820.

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM. “ From the commencement of the
 “ institution to its present wonderfully advanced state, it has had
 “ my good wishes : they remain unaltered, and will so remain dur-
 “ ing the short continuance of my mortal existence.” *Letter to
 Lord Teignmouth, 30th April, 1822.*

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY took part in the proceedings of the last meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM, President of the Hibernian Bible Society, presided at the annual meeting in April last ; *after* the secession of the Primate, and delivered an address, from which the following is extracted : “ Could I bring myself to think, when I
 “ see the successful exertions of this Society in the distribution of
 “ the sacred word of God ; when I see the blessed change wrought
 “ in a large proportion of the population of Ireland by this means,
 “ which God has evidently pointed out to be his will ; could I bring

“ myself to think when I see the happy effects of this institution
 “ in the glorious revival of the religion of Christ throughout the
 “ land ; when I see the book of God in the hands of thousands
 “ and tens of thousands of my poor fellow creatures, when but a
 “ very few years ago, scarcely one copy of it was to be found ;*
 “ when I see the hearts of the disobedient, through the simple
 “ reading of the Bible, put into their hands by this Society, turn-
 “ ing to the wisdom of the just : When I see all this, I say, could
 “ I be so infatuated as to bring myself to think that this Society
 “ *were thus casting out Devils by Beelzebub the Prince of the Devils,*
 “ yet would I not withdraw from them.”

“ So far from apprehending danger to the established Church
 “ from this Society, I do from my heart and soul believe it has
 “ been the means of securing many a wavering member of that
 “ Church, and of interesting in its cause many sincere and pious
 “ Christians dissenting from it.”

You are probably not aware Sir, that in representing the Epis-
 copate of the established Church as opposed to Bible Societies,
 you are in fact representing it, as alienated from the affections, the
 confidence, the veneration of its own communion. If the forty-five
 Prelates you have mentioned, be indeed hostile to the British and
 Foreign Bible Society, then are their opinions, their examples, their
 exhortations contemned, rejected, and treated with contempt by
 almost the whole nation—then are they arrayed in opposition to the
 rank, the piety, and the intelligence of the kingdom. By whom
 Sir, is this great association supported ? By a few disaffected, fa-
 natical dissenters ? On the rolls of its patrons will be found the
 names of the nephew of the late, and of the five brothers of the
 reigning Sovereign, including the heir apparent to the throne ;
 the efficient members of the present and former ministers ; the
 heads of each university, and a long train of nobles, patriots and
 philanthropists.†

* In 1805, it was computed, that in the southern part of Ireland, two thirds
 of the Protestant families were without Bibles ; and that among the Catholics,
 not more than one family in 500, had a copy of the Scriptures. The Hiber-
 nian Bible Society, has since that time, distributed 295,695 Bibles and Testa-
 ments.

† The following are or have been Presidents or Patrons of Auxiliary Socie-
 ties : and I am not aware that a single individual mentioned below, has ever

If a house divided against itself cannot stand, what melancholy auguries would you lead us to draw from the present state of the established Church! Think not Sir, that the patronage to which I allude, is silent and negative, confined to a trifling donation, or the acceptance of a nominal office. If the members of this Society are acting in opposition to the spiritual authority of the Church, their opposition is open and vigorous. The individual to whom

withdrawn his name from any Bible Society with which he has been connected, viz.

Members of the Royal Family.

H. R. H. Duke of Gloucester		H. R. H. Duke of Sussex	
H. R. H. Duke of York		H. R. H. Duke of Cambridge	
H. R. H. Duke of Kent		H. R. H. Duke of Cumberland	
Duke of Bedford	<i>Earls.</i>	<i>Earls.</i>	<i>Lords.</i>
— Manchester	Harcourt	Stamford	Bolton
— Grafton	Craven	Romney	Dacre
— Wellington	Radnor	Guilford	Milton
— Roxburgh	Darnley	Rock Savage	Strathaven
— Beaufort	Darhmouth	Denbigh	Stanley
— Portlandt	Liverpool	Balcarres	Holland
— Buckingham	Derby	Breadalbane	Gambier
<i>Marquises.</i>	Mexborough	<i>Viscounts.</i>	Calthorpe
Tavistock	Yarborough	Bulkeley	Ossutton
Winchester	Gwydia	Falmouth	Grey
Bute	Spencer	Morpeth	Grenville
Hastings	Orford	Barnard	Guildford
Buckingham	Egmont	Middleton	Glenberrie
Downshire	Watterpark	Hampden	Middleton
Northampton	De La War	Dudley	Colchester
Camden	Hardwick	Milton	Foley
Cornwallis	Fortescue	Exmouth	Vernon
<i>Earls.</i>	Harrowby	Ebrington	Hautry
Waldegrave	Morley	Saudon	Gray
Harewood	Digby	<i>Lords.</i>	Fortescue
Uxbridge	Coventry	Nugent	Gower
Onslow	Verulam	Cavendish	Lindsay
Rosslyn	Asburnham	Rivers	Exmouth
Pomfret	Egremont	Braybrook	Barham
Dysart	Fitzwilliam	Headly	Middleton
Yarmouth	Grosvenor	Howard	Carrington
Cardigan	Northesk	Astown	

To the above may be added the names of the three Prime Ministers, Mr. Perceval, Lord Castlereagh, and Mr. Canning, besides various members of the present cabinet.

the nation looks as its future monarch, thinks it no derogation of his rank to accept an office in even an auxiliary society; and they to whom the destinies of the empire are committed, are occasionally found sharing in the deliberations of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and hesitate not to vindicate in public the cause of the institution. The following extracts will show with what zeal and affection the Bible Society is cherished, by those laymen of the established Church, whose birth and official rank must give to their opinions a weight and influence most fatal to the permanency of that Church, if it be true, that they are acting in defiance of its Episcopate.

H. R. H. THE DUKE OF GLOUCESTER. "Gentlemen, I am satisfied I am speaking the *sentiments of my illustrious relatives*, as well as my own, when I testify to you our gratitude for your kindnesses to us; and express the greatest anxiety and readiness to render the warmest assistance—I say the warmest assistance to this good—this great—this glorious cause." *Speech before British and Foreign Bible Society, 1819.*

LORD CASTLEREAGH. "I trust I feel as strongly attached as any man to the particular merits of that religious system, which as an individual I profess,—to the established religion of the government under which we live; but I hope I shall not be suspected of indifference to that religion, when I reflect with gratitude and self-satisfaction, that amid those shades of difference which divide Christians among themselves, at home we are all united under the same standard, which it is now our object to plant to a still wider extent." *Speech before Westminster Bible Society, 1812.*

Mr. PERCIVAL when Prime Minister, had made an appointment to attend, at the formation of the Northamptonshire Auxiliary Society, but was assassinated before the day of meeting. His successor in office, Mr. Vansittart pronounced him "a steady and firm supporter of the Bible Society." *Speech before London Auxiliary Society, 1812.*

EARL OF LIVERPOOL, First Lord of the Treasury. In an address to the Cinque Ports Auxiliary Bible Society, of which he was President, "he adverted to the high station which he had the honour of holding in the government of the country, and the consequent duty which devolved upon him to maintain inviolate

“the trust thus reposed in him by his sovereign. With this impression, and with the firmest attachment which he had to the established Church of England, he could not from a sense of duty lend his support to any Society which stood opposed to it. In uniting with the Bible Society however, he conscientiously believed he was supporting the interest of the established Church in particular, and of Christianity at large.”

MR. VANSITTART, Chancellor of the Exchequer. “I should as a member of the Church, be very sorry to think, that the devout study of the Scriptures, would lead to a disregard of our liturgy : on the contrary, I should hope that it would produce a more general acknowledgment of its excellency, as it originally at the reformation, led, through the blessing of Divine Providence, to its establishment.” “But supposing, for the sake of argument, that there may be real danger from the preponderance of the dissenting interest, what is the remedy you propose?—that all Churchmen should withdraw themselves from the Society, and leave it wholly in the hands of the dissenters. If any thing can make the Society dangerous, this must do it, because there would then be no check to any sectarian spirit which might introduce itself, and which must be unavoidably irritated by so harsh, and I think, so unjust an indication of jealousy.” *Letter to Dr. Marsh, 1811.*

LORD HARROWBY, President of the Council. “I have not the happiness of being one of those who were early engaged in the ranks of this Society, —whether I was distracted by many other subjects, or whatever was the cause, such was the fact ; and what was it that first directed my attention to this subject ? *It was the sounding of the trumpet of alarm.*” “To argument on the subject I paid every possible attention—I have read every statement of facts on both sides the question, which was represented to me as worth reading ; and the deliberate result of that investigation has been a confirmation of the opinion which first struck me, that so far from any danger existing to the establishment of which I am a member, the union of that Church with the Society only adds to its credit, its dignity and its usefulness, and therefore cannot but add to its strength.” *Speech before British and Foreign Bible Society, 1818.*

Many more similar extracts might be given, from Laymen of high rank, and extensive influence : but I forbear : enough I trust

has been shown, to prove that the Clergy and Laity of this Diocese who support Bible Societies, may appeal with equal confidence with yourself, to the Established Church, for authority to sanction their conduct. But Sir, I feel my affection for that pure and holy Church in whose bosom I have been nurtured, glow with increased ardour, when I recollect that it is unnecessary for *me*, to resort to a *foreign* Church, to vindicate my endeavours to bless the poor and ignorant with that Gospel which has brought life and immortality to light. You tell us that it is to you “a source of painful regret,” to find yourself differing on the subject of Bible Societies “from many of the *Clergy* and members of our communion.” I should have supposed, that it would also have been a source of painful regret to you, to find yourself acting in direct opposition to the opinions of the *Bishops* of our communion, officially delivered. The Prelates of other Churches have indeed in their individual capacity patronised Bible Societies, but to the Bishops of the American Church, belongs the exclusive honour of having borne their united testimony in their behalf. In 1814, the Bishops of our Church, assembled in convention, addressed to the Episcopalians of the United States, a Pastoral Letter, in which they thus express themselves.

“ We avail ourselves of the opportunity of congratulating all the
 “ members of our Church, on what we conceive to be eminently
 “ a cause of joy to the Christian world in general. The wonder-
 “ ful efforts which have been made within these few years, being
 “ begun principally by members of the parent Church, by a body
 “ known under the name of the British and Foreign Bible Society,
 “ imitated in various countries of the old world ; and concurred in
 “ with alacrity and zeal throughout the extent of the American
 “ Union—to disperse the Bible in regions wherein it has been
 “ hitherto unknown, and in those wherein the religion of it is pro-
 “ fessed, to provide that none shall have reason to complain of
 “ their being necessarily destitute of this instructor, this guide,
 “ and this source of the highest consolations. *We should conceive*
 “ *ourselves as wanting, on this occasion, to the high duties of our*
 “ *stations, were we to neglect to bear our testimony in favour of this*
 “ *energetic effort for the disappointment of the wicked designs of*
 “ *infidelity, for the extending of the influence of pure and undefiled*
 “ *religion, and finally, for the carrying into effect of those gracious*
 “ *promises of Heaven, which will not have been accomplished,*

“until the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.”*

However painful I may feel it, to differ in opinion from you Sir, for whose zeal and talents I cannot but entertain unfeigned respect; yet far more painful would it be, to concur with you in believing that the course thus recommended by the most reverend authority in our Church, was “erroneous in principle,” injurious in its tendency, and “a departure from the apostolic mode of propagating Christianity.”

Could it be necessary, after so solemn and deliberate a sanction of Bible Societies by the House of Bishops, to adduce further proof of their approbation, I might appeal to their succeeding pastoral letter of 1817, in which, mentioning the indications of the growing influence of religion, they incidentally allude to “the vast increase of editions of Bibles, as well those for sale, as those designed for gratuitous distribution through the medium of the numerous Societies, who of late years have associated for conveying of that invaluable treasure to the houses and the bosoms of the most destitute of the people.” We might also appeal to the offices in Bible Societies which are *now* held by Bishops White, Moore, Kemp, Griswold, and Chase. It is true, Sir, that some of our Bishops are not subscribers to Bible Societies, but I am acquainted with only *one* who has *opposed* them. If we turn to the laity of our church, we find that those whom she is most proud to number among her sons, have yielded a ready obedience to the exhortation of the House of Bishops, and have given to Bible Societies their zealous and cordial support.

With the courtesy towards your opponents which you have

* Of this letter Bishop Hobart thus speaks, in his address to the New-York Convention of 1814. “This pastoral letter contains such spiritual counsel as the situation of the Church seemed to require; and will I trust, evidence the solicitude of the Bishops, in their capacity as the spiritual guardians of the Church, to promote the diffusion of evangelical piety, as professed in her articles and liturgy; and, at the same time, to guard against all methods of effecting this desirable end, which are not agreeable to the spirit of her apostolic and primitive institutions.”

It is a little difficult to reconcile the concluding sentiment of this encomium on the letter of the House of Bishops, with the intimation given in the Bishop's own pastoral letter of the succeeding year, (page 19,) that by joining those very societies which the “spiritual guardians of the Church” had so unequivocally approved, we would “put in jeopardy our apostolic ministry, and primitive and evangelical worship.”

ever observed in this controversy, you speak of Governor Jay and General Clarkson, the President and acting Vice President of the American Bible Society as "individuals who are not for a moment "to be suspected of acting from any other principle, than a sense "of duty, and whose pure and elevated characters adorn the "Church of which they are members." But did it not occur to you Sir, that in calling the public attention to the disregard with which such churchmen as Governor Jay and General Clarkson treat your advice and complaints, you were furnishing the Episcopal Laymen who support these institutions, with the most venerable and weighty precedents for their conduct. These two gentlemen however are not the only pure and elevated characters in our Church, who concur in the sentiments of the House of Bishops. The names of William Tilghman, Duncan Cameron, Francis S. Key, Charles Goldsborough and Bushrod Washington are found among the Vice Presidents of the American Bible Society. "I was ardent in my wishes and exertions," says Judge Washington, writing to the Secretary of the National Society in 1820, "for its "establishment, and it has been conducted with so much judgment "and zeal, as to exceed in its practical results, my most sanguine "expectations. May that Being in whose service the Society is "engaged to spread throughout his dominions upon earth a knowledge of the Word of Divine Life, smile upon and give effect to "their exertions."

"The apostles," says Governor Jay in his late address, "were "opposed in preaching the Gospel, but they nevertheless persisted—we are opposed in dispersing the Scriptures, which convey "the knowledge of it—and let us follow their example. An eminent ancient counsellor gave excellent advice to *their* adversaries, and his reasoning affords salutary admonition to *our* opponents. That advice merits attention and was concluded in the "following memorable words. 'Refrain from these men and let "them alone,—for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will "come to naught, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it,— "lest haply ye be found to fight against God.'"

It thus appears Sir, that you are unhappily found differing, not only from many of the *Clergy* of "our communion," not only from your "venerable father in the Episcopate," but from the official declarations of the assembled Bishops of our Church, and from her most distinguished Laymen; from the pure and elevated charac-

ters of your own Diocess—nay, of your own congregation ; and on referring to the Established Church of Great Britain, we have found the voice of her Prelates and Laity raised in opposition to the sentiments of your charge.

There are other Churches Sir, whose government is equally Scriptural and apostolic with our own, and whose Prelates are equally responsible for the exercise of that influence which their exalted stations confer on their example and advice. You have informed us* that the Greek Church, and the Churches of Sweden and Denmark are Episcopal in substance, as well as form, and consequently the opinions of the spiritual guardians of these Churches on the subject of Bible Societies cannot be unimportant. I have no evidence that a single Prelate of these Churches, has ever directly or indirectly opposed these institutions. But this it may be said, is only negative testimony ; suffer me then to add, that which is positive† and let it be borne in mind that the Societies alluded to in the following extracts from speeches and letters, are established on precisely the same principle as the American Bible Society,—

* An apology for Apostolic Order—page 100.

† In the proceedings of the Russian, Swedish and Danish Bible Societies, I find the names of the following Prelates, numbered among their members and supporters, viz.

OF THE RUSSIAN B. S.

Archbishops.

Moscow

Jaróslaff

Tchernegoff

Polotsk

Moghiley

Minsk

Pskoff

Kief

Astrakan

Irkutsk

Abxhasia

Pleskoff

Polotski

Twer

St. Petersburg

Kasan

Bishops.

Perma

Dimitrief

Stara Russa

Bishops.

Tula

Voronez

Orel

Archangel

Pultawa

Volhynia

Borg

Novogorod

Kaluga

Kursk

Kharkon

Finland

OF THE SWEDISH B. S.

Archbishop of Upsula,

Primate of Sweden

Bishops.

West Mania

Gothland

Göthenburg

Scania

Christiana

Bishops.

Carlstadt

Hernosand,

Lund

Norway

Skarce

Wexio

Linkoping

Calma

OF THE DANISH B. S.

Bishops.

Zealand

Iceland

Odensee

Tuhen

Ripen

Aarhuus

Viborg

Aalborg

Ribe

the distribution of the Scriptures, without note or comment, by the combined exertions of Christians of every name.

ARCHBISHOP OF MOSCOW.—“How sacred, how salutary, how pleasing to God, must this institution be!—And God himself hath borne witness to this; for he blesseth it, in a remarkable manner.” “Coldness towards the Bible Society, cannot be without a mixture of coldness towards the Bible itself; that is, towards true Christianity which the Bible propagates.”

ARCHBISHOP OF POLOTSK. “I consider it my sacred duty, to second with all my strength, the intentions of the most honourable Society.”

ARCHBISHOP OF KIEF. ‘Verily it may be said, that every sincere receiver of the Word of God, after reading the report of the Moscow Bible Society, and beholding the success and the wonderful powers of the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, manifested in this work, cannot but feel the sweetest joy and consolation, and give glory to the gracious Providence of our Heavenly Father.’

BISHOP OF STARA RUSSA. “Oh that the Father of all goodness, who has raised, honoured and blessed Russia above all the nations of the earth, may grant his blessing on the labours of the Committee of the Russian Bible Society.”

ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA, Primate of Sweden,—In a pastoral letter to his Clergy, urging them to join the Bible Society, says “the door is opened, my Brethren, to promote the increase of Christ’s kingdom; and who ought to have this more at heart than ourselves, who are called to spread the Saving Knowledge of God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.”

BISHOP OF GOTHENBURG. “Love to our neighbour, ought to knit into one brotherly band, every rank of men in Bible Societies.” The Bishops of Skara, Wexio and Hernosand, each addressed a Pastoral Letter to their respective Clergy, recommending the Bible Society.

BISHOP OF ZEALAND. “In our sphere of action, a voice is now and then heard to rise in opposition to the Bible Society, but its effects have proved *favourable to the good cause*, as the apologies to which it has given birth, have by the force of truth, gained over many to espouse the Scriptures and their dissemination.” “The opposition to Bible Societies is too feeble to cause the shipwreck, or even a retrograde movement of an un-

“dertaking which every circumstance *declares to be favoured by Providence*, as a means of diffusing the light of Christianity, and that “spiritual rule and hope which are the richest sources of happiness to mankind.”

I have thus Sir, brought to a conclusion, my promised, and I fear tedious examination of the episcopal patronage enjoyed by Bible Societies; and to you Sir, am I indebted for the discovery I have made, of the extreme feebleness of the opposition in England, and of the abundant and almost unanimous support they have received from the Bishops of every Christian Church, with the exception of that of Rome. Had you not marshalled the Prelates whom you supposed hostile to these Societies, it would not probably have occurred to me to array their friends in the opposite rank; but

Fas est, ab hoste doceri.

But Sir, the question of Bible Societies is presented in your charge, as one, not merely of expediency, but of “principle;” you deny not only their utility, but their *lawfulness*. These Societies in your opinion cause the separation of the Word and the Church of God; they sanction a departure from the apostolic mode of propagating Christianity, and their success it seems, is not to be considered as evidence of the favour of Heaven. And does it not awaken Sir, some mistrust of the correctness of your opinions, to find yourself at issue on a point of Christian duty, with every Protestant Church in Christendom? No sect, however wild its doctrines; no Church, however loose its discipline and practice, but still confesses the mighty truth, that the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, and therefore professes both its obligation and its willingness to disseminate them.

With your opinion of the unlawfulness of these associations, how painful to you must be those efforts of the Sovereigns of Europe to bless their subjects with the word of life, which are viewed by other Christians with devout gratulation. Suffer me Sir, to call your attention to these efforts, not for the purpose of adding to your apprehensions, but of exhibiting farther instances of that wonderful excitement in the cause of the Bible, which is now filling the world with the knowledge of the Lord, and which I cannot refrain, however fanatical you may deem me, from attributing to another, than a human origin. The following marks of national patronage bestowed upon Bible Societies, will also prove, that the

dangers to civil society, which some of their opponents and particularly the Bishop of Chester, apprehend from them, are wholly overlooked by those, who are most interested in guarding against them.

RUSSIA. The Bibles as well as letters of the Russian Bible Society, are transported throughout this vast empire, at the public expense. The Emperor presented the Society with a spacious edifice for the transaction of its business; gave 25,000 rubles to its funds, and desired to be considered a member, with an annual subscription of 10,000 rubles.

PRUSSIA. The King has exempted the letters of the Prussian Bible Society, and of its Auxiliaries from postage.

SWEDEN. The King ordered a collection to be made once a year in all the Churches of the Diocese of Gottenburgh, for the Gottenburgh Bible Society. He accepted the office of Patron of the Swedish Bible Society, and has exempted its letters and parcels from postage. He likewise ordered a collection to be made in every Church in the kingdom, for the purpose of supplying the poor with Bibles.

DENMARK. The King gave \$4000 to the Danish Bible Society, and reduced the postage on Bibles.

SAXONY. The government granted to the Saxon Bible Society the privilege of receiving letters and parcels free of postage.

WURTEMBERG. The King officially announced his approbation of the Wurtemberg Bible Society, and made a donation to its funds.

FRANCE. The Government allowed the Paris Bible Society to import Bibles free of duty. The Duke D'Angouleme, with the concurrence of the King, addressed a letter to the Society, expressing his approbation of its designs. The Duke de Cazes, at the time Prime Minister, gave 1000 livres to the Society.

GREAT BRITAIN. The Government invariably remits the duties on the books imported by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Well indeed did the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain exclaim; "The Kings of the earth have indeed stood up, and its rulers have taken counsel together; but it has not been against the Lord and his Anointed—it has not been to extinguish the light of the Gospel in the blood of its professors —but to acknowledge its authority and extend its influence."*

* Speech before the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1816

But do not, Sir understand me, as intending to represent the cause of Bible Societies, as universally triumphant. I acknowledge that it has numerous, powerful and implacable foes ; and truth demands the admission, that both in withholding your support from these associations, and in maintaining their mischievous and unscriptural character, you are "acting with those in the highest stations" of an ancient and widely extended Church.

The following extracts from the Bull of Pius VII. to the Primate of Poland, issued 29th June, 1816, show that the Sovereign Pontiff was not less zealous than yourself in reprobating these Societies.

"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device" (Bible Societies) "by which the very foundations of religion are undermined." "We have deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this *pestilence* as far as possible." "This defilement of the faith so imminently dangerous to souls." "It becomes an *episcopal* duty, that you first of all expose the *wickedness of this nefarious scheme*." "It is evident from experience, that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit." "Warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the *snare prepared for their everlasting ruin*." "The deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of *tares*, which an *adversary* has so abundantly sown."

In a pastoral charge delivered by the Roman Catholic Bishop Milner, of Ireland, in 1813, on the subject of Bible Societies, we find the following ; alluding to the efforts of Protestants to distribute the Scriptures, he says, "in acting thus, *they* act conformably to the fundamental principles of *their* religion, which teach the Bible contains all things necessary for salvation, and that it is easy to be understood by any person of common sense." He then goes on much in the manner of Mr. O'Callaghan and Dr. Maltby, to prove how very unintelligible the sacred volume is. and declares "a plain Catholic *peasant*, who is well grounded in the knowledge of his *Catechism*, really knows more of the Word of God, as to the sense and substance of it, than a Methodist preacher who can repeat the words of the whole Bible by heart." We may therefore, I think, conclude that, in Bishop Milner's opinion, "we distribute the Scriptures in the manner *best calculated* to promote a

“knowledge of their sacred contents, when we distribute” *the Roman Catholic Catechism*; and that he who will read this Catechism, will become acquainted with all “which can be necessary to form his faith, to regulate his obedience, to inspire his hopes, and to guide his devotions.”

The deference I might feel for the authority of the Pope, is I confess, not a little lessened by the character given of him in your writings,* where we are assured that the Reformers denounced him as “Antichrist,” the “Man of Sin,” the “Son of Perdition.” and the assertion of our Homily, that “they” (the Popes and Prelates of the Church of Rome) “are worthily accounted among the number of false prophets, and false Christs, which deceived the world a long time;” forbids me to pay the slightest regard to Bishop Milner’s admonitions.

To your Episcopal allies whom I have named, is still to be added a layman, not unknown to fame, and who may be regarded as the representative of a very large portion of the foes whom Bible Societies are compelled to encounter; Mr. COBBETT thus expresses himself on the subject of distributing the Bible without note or comment, but his reasoning is so similar to what I have met with in other quarters, that I can scarcely acquit him of plagiarism.

“Reading the Scriptures if universal *can lead to nothing but schism*, which at present is prevented only by the want of what is called study in reading them. Is it possible for those who can hardly read words, to derive real benefit from the perusal of such a book? No, it is from the expositions and applications of the contents of the Bible, by learned men, or by others who use their expositions and applications, that the people are to profit.”

Mr. Cobbett’s advice on religious subjects cannot but be received with some hesitation, by those who recollect the devotion he has evinced to the memory of the author of the Age of Reason, in removing his remains to his native island.

There is still Sir, one more personage, who I believe is to be found in the ranks of opposition; and that I may not be deemed guilty of personal disrespect towards yourself, I beg you to remember that I place him there, on the authority of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne. In the passage from the speech of this Prelate, alrea-

* Apology for the Apostolic Order.—Page 90.

dy quoted, he numbers "the great enemy of our race" with the opposers of Bible Societies. But if the character you give of these Societies be correct, then must this enemy of our race, be one of their most zealous and active supporters. If these institutions "put in jeopardy our apostolic ministry, and primitive and evangelical worship;" if only in distributing the Bible with the Prayer-Book, we follow the *scriptural* plan of evangelizing the world; if they be "erroneous in principle;" if they cause "the separation of the Church from the Word of God;" if "a due regard to principle, to sound policy, and even Christian harmony" requires you to oppose them; can we conceive it possible that He who worketh in the children of disobedience, and who can transform himself into an angel of light, should neglect so fair an opportunity to counteract the Scriptural plan of evangelizing the world; by beguiling Christians, under the idea of promoting Christianity, to establish and extend institutions so erroneous in principle, and so injurious in their tendency. You will not therefore be surprised, if I feel anxious to disown so unwelcome an auxiliary; and if, since his character forbids the supposition of his neutrality in a contest of so much moment, I prefer seeing him in the ranks of my opponents: and I confess Sir, that when I find it declared in Scripture, that Satan "taketh the word out of their hearts," I cannot be persuaded that he is instrumental in putting it into their hands.

But although I concur with the Bishop of Cloyne, in believing that the Prince of this world is among the opponents of Bible Societies, God forbid, that I should impute to them, the motives by which he himself is unquestionably actuated. Good intentions however, do not invariably lead to judicious conduct; and although I am very far from impeaching the sincerity with which you disclaim "the imputation of being unfriendly to the distribution of the Oracles of truth," yet I must be permitted to contend, however "unjust, injurious or unkind" you may deem me, that you are in fact although unintentionally pursuing the very conduct you disavow.

"You take from me my life,
"When you do take the means, whereby I live:"

And surely Sir, in endeavouring to destroy the only instruments whereby the distribution of the Oracles of Truth can be effected; you are labouring to prevent the distribution of those Oracles themselves. That we may more fully appreciate the efficiency of

these instruments, let us take a retrospect of their number, and results. In 1804, the British and Foreign Bible Society was established, and since that period, through its kind and fostering care, kindred institutions have been planted in every land where the Bible is regarded as the rule of faith, and where the civil power is not in abject subserviency to the Church of Rome. Two thousand five hundred Bible Societies, embracing Christians of every name and rank, from the monarch to the humblest peasant, are now actively and zealously engaged in making known to their fellow-men, the revelation of Jehovah, and the Gospel of his Son. In Great Britain, we find the parent Society aided by 716 Auxiliaries, and enjoying the magnificent income of \$460,880. Scarcely a parish in the United Kingdoms, that is not included within the bounds of a Bible Society.

The Cantons of Switzerland have established similar institutions. The Sleswick Holstein Society numbers 118 Auxiliaries. In the kingdom of Wurtemberg, exists a National Society with 44 branches; another in Hanover with 23 Auxiliaries, and in every part of Protestant Germany these associations have been formed, without distinction of sect. In Prussia, the National Society, patronised by the monarch, has 38 Auxiliaries. The Bible Societies of Russia, are now supplying that vast empire with the Bread of Life, and encouraged by imperial countenance, and the prayers of the Prelates of the Established Church, are now printing the Scriptures in twenty-six languages. Two hundred Auxiliaries pour into the treasury of the Russian Bible Society the gifts of the pious from the shores of the Baltic, to those of the Euxine and the Caspian. Sweden, Norway and Denmark have joined the holy union, and have established great and efficient institutions, assisted by numerous Auxiliaries. The Netherlands Society, counts upwards of 50 Auxiliaries, and in that kingdom, in which but a few years since, death was proclaimed to be an eternal sleep, a Bible Society assisted by 40 Auxiliaries is now diffusing the knowledge of Him, who is the resurrection and the life; and in that city in which so many edicts have been published against the religion of the Gospel, and the happiness of mankind, are now issued the monthly "*Bulletins de la Société Biblique Protestante de Paris.*" In Iceland, in Malta, in the Islands of the Ionian Sea, and even on that spot, where the apostle of the Gentiles once preached to his polished and philosophic hearers, their unknown God, Bible Societies are now publishing the unsearchable riches of Christ.

Do we turn our eyes to Asia, wherever the doctrines of the Cross are taught distinct from papal superstition, we find Bible Societies engaged in making known the way of the Lord to the numerous nations of that vast continent. From one extremity of Hindoostan to the other, from Bombay to Calcutta, from Madras to Columbo, from New-Holland to Amboyna, are Protestants of every name, knit together in this sacred fraternity.

Even in Africa; in that region and shadow of death, a great light is sprung up, and the African Bible Society at the Cape of Good Hope, in conjunction with those of Sierra Leone, Caledon, Mauritius and Bourbon, are now conferring upon Africa a blessing which infinitely outweighs all her wrongs, even the blessing of the Gospel of peace.

In North America, we behold a chain of these institutions extending from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Missouri to the Atlantic. In the United States alone, more than 300 Societies are enrolled among the Auxiliaries of the National Institution; while in the British dominions, both on the continent and in the West Indies, are found numerous Societies connected with the parent Society in England. Truly indeed has it been said of the British and Foreign Bible Society, that she has taken her stand, upon that fulcrum which Archimedes never found, and has moved the world. And what Sir, has been effected by this splendid and extensive machinery? The Bible has been translated and circulated, whole or in part, in 139 languages and dialects, of which 43 are reprints, 8 retranslations, and 88 *entirely new translations into languages in which the Scriptures had never been printed before the establishment of Bible Societies*. The British and Foreign Bible Society, has expended in this great work \$4,438,000, and has, together with the continental Societies, issued the almost incredible number of SIX MILLIONS AND FIFTY-SIX THOUSAND BIBLES AND TESTAMENTS. These Societies have opposed to infidelity a host of influential witnesses, proclaiming their belief in the Holy Scriptures—they have introduced the Bible into the dwellings of the poor, thus furnishing the most effectual antidote to irreligious and licentious writings: they “have roused the attention of a thoughtless world to the momentous concerns of eternity, and to the study of that world which reveals the only way to peace and salvation;” and they have bound together in the bonds of Christian amity and sympathy, the most distant nations, and the most discordant sects; and directed their resources and their energies to the

dissemination of the Oracles of the one living and true God. And you Sir, are now exerting your talents and your influence to lock up "this floodgate of mercy;" to quench this "sun which has arisen unexpectedly and gloriously, to illuminate the dark horizon of a fallen world;" and yet, strange to tell, you deem the insinuation, that you are unfriendly to the distribution of the oracles of truth "unjust, injurious, and unkind." Alas Sir! your anxiety for the circulation of the Bible, is most assuredly

"Amabilis insania, et mentis gratissimus error."

As you have pointed out to us a Book, which will answer the purposes of the Bible, so you have directed our attention to a substitute for Bible Societies, and this substitute I will now proceed to examine. In order fully to understand the nature and design of Bible and Prayer Book Societies, it will be necessary to revert to the period of their first establishment. Bible Societies had already been organized in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and Connecticut; and the citizens of New-York resolved to follow the example of their brethren, and made preparations for establishing a similar Society. Notice of these preparations, was given to the then Bishop of New-York, and the co-operation of Episcopalians solicited. But *after* this notice had been given, and *before* these preparations were completed, the New-York Bible and Prayer Book Society was ushered into being, an antidote to the spreading influence of Bible Societies. Within a few weeks after this event, the New-York Bible Society was formed, and after the lapse of seven years, not one episcopal Clergyman, and only three episcopal laymen, were numbered among its members. Is it uncharitable to believe, that this effect was foreseen and intended by the founders of the Bible and Prayer Book Society? It is a painful truth, that these associations have evinced a deliberate, inveterate and systematic hostility to Bible Societies, and have laboured to convince Episcopalians, that they were dangerous to the Church, and repugnant to the will of God. It is far from my intention to impute to all the subscribers to Bible and Prayer Book Societies, the sentiments avowed in their printed reports, and in the addresses of their patrons; for these sentiments the founders, and active agents and patrons of these Societies, are alone responsible. A brief examination of the writings of these persons, will abundantly substantiate the charge of their hostility to Bible Societies.

The Report of the New-York Bible and Prayer Book Society for 1811, says "The Bible and Common Prayer Book should be *constantly* united by the members of the Church." In their Report for 1818, they inform us "The Church as a visible Society "should ever be recognised, her enlargement and due organization "should be sought, *as one with the promotion of the religion of the "Gospel*; it was this evangelical principle that gave birth to the "Society whose concerns we are now called to report." Hence it follows, that their members cannot without violating the fundamental principle of their association, unite in Bible Societies, which, although they greatly promote the religion of the Gospel, do not expressly seek the enlargement and due organization of the Church. On turning to the first report of the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society, we find the following "The "same duty that animates us to distribute the Bible, impels us to "accompany the blessing with the Book of Common Prayer." This extraordinary sentiment is reiterated in the second Report; "Should we not," say the managers, "as Protestant Episcopalians, "throw away the precious fruits of the Reformation, did we not "stand with the Bible in one hand, and the Book of Common "Prayer in the other?" The Report proceeds: "To leave men "in uncertainty as to what they should believe or disbelieve, is to "bewilder their minds, and subject them to the probable danger of "embracing no creed at all. The true religion has been preserved "from the beginning by the Church of Christ, and it will continue "to preserve it. It was upon *these principles* that the Society to "which this is auxiliary was founded." That is, the revelation which an all-wise God has seen fit to make of his will, to his erring and accountable creatures, is in the opinion of these gentlemen, likely to leave them in uncertainty as to what they should believe; and the Prayer Book is to complete what the Almighty left imperfect.

In the Report of the Johnstown Bible and Prayer Book Society for 1820, they observe, "However much we might honour the exertions of those engaged in the great work of distributing the "Bible without note or comment, *we in conscience* believed their "system to be defective, and departing from the true and primitive method of propagating the knowledge of God."

"You have undoubtedly discovered," said the managers of the Connecticut Bible and Prayer Book Society, in their address to

Episcopalians, "sufficient to satisfy you, that in these objects you
 "as Episcopalians ought to act distinctly and independently of those
 "denominations of Christians, whose ideas of the ministry and
 "worship of the Church, are totally different from your own.
 "Were we confined to the *single* object of distributing the Bible,
 "the general interests of Christianity could not be promoted by
 "uniting with them."

In your address Sir, before the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer-Book Society, you remark, "In translating and publishing
 "the Liturgy in *conjunction* with the Bible, and distributing *them*
 "throughout the world, we follow the *Scriptural* plan of evangelizing it. We present to them God's Word and God's Church." Again: "Never lose sight of its *cardinal principle*, the *combined*
 "distribution of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer. Let no
 "solicitations, and no assaults, direct or *indirect*, induce you to
 "deviate from this principle." We have however Sir seen, that our Bishops have used "solicitations" to induce us to deviate from this principle, and to unite ourselves with Societies which present God's Word, without his Church. Let us now listen to Dr. How. In his address before the same Society, he says, "The members
 "of the Society thought it their duty to proceed in their efforts to
 "diffuse the light of religious truth, upon the *Scriptural* plan of
 "uniting the Word and the Church of God." Again: "Let us then
 "my brethren direct our efforts to the general establishment of
 "Bible and Prayer Book Societies, among the members of our
 "Church, *thus* pursuing the *divine method* of spreading religious
 "truth, by holding out the Church of God in connexion with his
 "Word." Of course Bible Societies reject the plan of spreading religious truth, which God himself ordained.

The Rev. Mr. Bayard, in his address before the Female Bible and Prayer Book Society of New-Ark, asks the following very pertinent question, "Why not form distinct Societies for the distribution of the Bible, and others, for the gift of the Book of Common Prayer?—Why not unite in Bible Societies, and form Prayer Book Societies among ourselves?" To this he replies, "Episcopalians consider religion and the Church as indissolubly
 "united by *divine* authority;" that is, if there be any meaning in the passage—to separate the Bible and Prayer Book is to separate what God has joined! Alas, we shall presently see that our *Scriptural* Societies have been guilty of effecting this impious divorce,

by sending abroad vast numbers of Prayer Books, unattended by their divine companion.

In your Pastoral Letter of 1815, in urging the establishment of Bible and Prayer Book Societies, you argue, that it is no objection to them that they “ would prevent Episcopalians from associating with other denominations of Christians in Bible Societies,” and in your celebrated Newspaper Address, against the American Bible Society, you observe, “ By encouraging these institutions,” (Bible and Prayer Book Societies) “ and by not connecting yourselves with the proposed Bible Society, you will avoid the hazard to say the least, of occasioning serious injury to the interests of the Church in this Diocese, of interrupting her harmony, and arresting the spirit of zeal for her principles which is now leading her to prosperity.”

Let us now inquire into the principles on which the hostility of these Societies to Bible Societies is founded. They seem to regard the importance of the Prayer Book to the salvation of mankind, as equal if not superior to that of the Bible itself. The New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society, as we have seen, intimates that to distribute the Bible alone, is “ to leave men in uncertainty as to what they are to believe or disbelieve,” and the New-York Bible and Prayer Book Society authoritatively declares that “ Episcopalians, in their charitable efforts to diffuse Christianity, should unite the Book of Common Prayer with the Bible.” We have already seen that in your opinion we “ distribute the Holy Scriptures *in the manner best calculated* to diffuse a knowledge of their sacred contents, when we distribute the Book of Common Prayer,” and in your address to the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society, you say “ The Bible and the Book of Common Prayer—let this be your *sacred* motto. The distribution of *these*, by God’s blessing, will be the means of shedding celestial light on a world dark and ignorant; of bringing to a *world* disconsolate and dreary, the comforts of Heaven.” You likewise remark, “ This” (the union of the Bible and Prayer Book) “ is also the course which *common* sense points out. In presenting to an individual an instrument of great length, of great variety of matter, written by different persons, in different styles, at a remote period, would not common sense dictate that a summary of its contents sanctioned by the judgment of wise and learned men, through a long course

“ of ages, should also be presented.” Thus we are given to understand, that the Scriptures are so obscure, that it is folly, a violation of common sense, to distribute them, unless we also give the Prayer Book, as a key to unlock their hidden treasures. Alas Sir, the judicious Hooker did not think it necessary, thus to undervalue the Scriptures, in order to exalt the Church. “ Surely the power of the Word of God,” says this distinguished Churchman, “ *even without the help of interpreters in God’s church,*” “ worketh mightily, not only to their confirmation alone which “ are already converted, but also to their conversion which are “ not.” “ Scripture is not so hard, but that *the only reading there- “ of may give life to willing hearers.”* *Ecc. Pol. 22, Book V. Sect.*

Hooker’s zeal for the Church was accompanied with a thorough knowledge of her spirit and doctrines. In maintaining the life-giving efficacy of the Scriptures, unaided by human commentaries, he only spoke the sentiments of the Church herself. “ Whatsoever is required to the salvation of Man,” says our first Homily, “ is fully contained in the Scripture of God—He that is ignorant, may there learn and have knowledge.” “ They” (the Scriptures) “ have power to *turn* through God’s promise, and they be effectual through God’s assistance.”

Another most extraordinary principle maintained by these Societies and their active patrons, is, that the Scriptures require a *combined* and *simultaneous* distribution of the Bible and Prayer Book, or in their own strange phraseology, of “ the Word, and the Church of God.” Although this sentiment is reiterated again and again in their reports and addresses ; yet I am not ignorant that in a *note* to your address before the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society, with singular inconsistency you remark, “ Bibles and Prayer Books should be distributed together where “ they are both wanted and will be received, and in other cases, “ separately, as *expediency* may dictate.” And if *expediency* may justify Bible and Prayer Book Societies in separating the Word and the Church of God,—in departing from the apostolic mode of propagating Christianity ; why Sir, will you not allow Bible Societies to avail themselves of the same plea ? But Sir, the language of your address, and of the Reports of the Societies, is greatly at variance with that of your note.

You declare in your address, that “ in translating and publishing the Liturgy in *conjunction* with the Bible. and dis-

“tributing them throughout the world, we follow the Scriptural “plan of evangelizing it—we present God’s Word, and God’s “Church.” Surely Sir, we had a right to expect from the Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, language less vague and unintelligible than this. Are the students in your seminary to be taught, that the “Liturgy” constitutes the Church of God? or that all that is necessary to evangelize the world, is to scatter Bibles and Liturgies throughout its population? What Sir, is the Christian ministry and the ordinances of the Gospel, of no avail in evangelizing the World? Has the command “preach the Gospel to every creature” been revoked? Truly Sir, you do indeed separate the Word and the Church of God, to a most alarming extent; and I would cheerfully concur with you in charging this same offence upon the members of Bible Societies, were they to maintain, that all that was necessary to evangelize the world, was to distribute the Bible. We know indeed, that the study of the Scriptures is one of the means of grace, and that it has often proved without extraneous aid, the power of God unto salvation. But we also know, that the Author of our religion has established a visible Church, and has provided for that Church certain ordinances which are also means of grace, and has constituted a ministry by whom those ordinances are to be administered, and by whom the people may be more immediately called to faith and repentance. He therefore who should aim at the conversion of the *world* by distributing the Bible alone, or even with the Prayer Book under the same cover, and should use no other means, would certainly not “follow the Scriptural plan of evangelizing it.” But you will not deny, I presume, that the Gospel will never be generally and effectually *preached*, where it is not also *distributed*, and that a Church without the Bible, is a body without a soul, a corrupt and loathsome corpse. If then the distribution of the Bible is not only one of the means of converting the world, but if it be absolutely indispensable to the establishment and extension of the Christian Church, with what justice can those who use the most effectual means ever devised for spreading the Scriptures, and are thus preparing the way for Missionaries, Churches, and Christian ordinances, be accused of separating the Word and the Church of God? I admit Sir, that if the members of Bible Societies use no other means to evangelize the world than circulating the Scriptures; if

they send no Missionaries—if they build no Churches—if they instruct no children—if they supply the destitute with none of the ordinances of the Gospel ; they are guilty of the charge you bring against them ; but I beg that in your next publication against Bible Societies, you will demonstrate that the great exertions which are now making in Europe and America to evangelize the world by the preaching of Christian ministers are confined solely to the opponents of these institutions.

But you may ask me Sir, if I acknowledge the obligation of extending the Church of Christ, as well as of diffusing his Word ; and if I admit as I most cheerfully do, that the Prayer Book is calculated to extend that Church, why I object to Societies which distribute both books ? This is a fair, but by no means, an embarrassing inquiry. The object of Bible and Prayer Book Societies abstractedly considered, is in the highest degree laudable, and had they like the Christian Knowledge Society in England, been established before, and not in *opposition* to Bible Societies, and did they maintain no heretical doctrines, no friend to the Church or the Scriptures, could reasonably object to them, and accordingly before their tendency and designs were fully developed, they received the almost unanimous support of Episcopalians in this city. But when they represent as dangerous and unscriptural, the only means which can prove effectual in supplying the world with the Book of Life—when the most gross and flagrant inconsistency is discovered between their professions and their actions—when they tend to introduce schism and parties into the Church, and loudly and perseveringly condemn the very associations which the assembled Bishops of the Church recommended to the patronage of their flocks, it becomes in my opinion the duty of every friend of the Bible, of every sincere and zealous Episcopalian, to discountenance them. To deny that these Societies have done good, would be to call in question the excellency of the Bible and Prayer Book ; but the question is, not whether they have done some good, but whether they have not *prevented* greater good. The first obvious consequence of these institutions, is the *division of effort in the Bible cause*. Common sense and daily experience prove the superior efficacy of united funds and concentrated labours, over the same funds and labours directed into different channels, and applied to distinct although similar objects. But do these Societies, by their own exertions, endeavour to counteract the injury resulting from

this division of effort, and agreeably to their solemn and oft repeated professions, circulate the Bible in *conjunction* with the Prayer Book ? Alas, Sir, they have thoroughly imbibed the spirit of your maxim, “ we distribute the Holy Scriptures in the manner *best calculated* to promote a knowledge of their sacred contents, when we distribute the Book of Common Prayer.”

On turning to the last Report of the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society, we find that the total amount of their issues for the preceding year was ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEEN Prayer Books and *ninety-two* Bibles !! And these are the young gentlemen, who in their own opinion would throw away the precious fruits of the reformation, did they not stand with the Bible in one hand, and the Book of Common Prayer in the other ! No wonder they are compelled to make the following mortifying confession. “ So far from being supported by increasing liberality, “ a large portion of our members when called upon for their subscription, have withdrawn their names, and while our resources “ are thus continually decreasing, very few subscribers are added “ to our list.”* Yet these gentlemen, thus frowned upon by their own Church, read lectures to their brother churchmen on their “ excursive charity” and “ erratic liberality” and have the modesty to ask Clergymen belonging to Bible Societies, to distribute these censures upon themselves, among their own parishioners. This same Society, which declares “ that the same duty which animates “ them to distribute the Bible, impels them to *accompany* the blessing with the Book of Common Prayer,” with admirable consistency, give notice that they will supply for gratuitous distribution *any* number of Bibles and Prayer Books, Bibles at 85 cents, and Prayer Books at 30 cents. Hence if they can but get their *price*, they are ready to separate the Word and the Church of God, to *any* extent.

Six years after the organization of the Albany Bible and Prayer Book Society, they had not purchased one Bible for distribution, and the few they gave away, were a present from the British and Foreign Bible Society ; their funds being appropriated to the purchase of Prayer Books only !

The conscientious members of the Johnstown Bible and Prayer Book Society, who in their “ conscience” believe Bible Societies

* Seventh Report.

to be a departure "from the primitive method of propagating "Christianity," distributed, as appears by their report for 1820, *twenty Bibles and ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY Prayer Books!*

But the Central Bible and Prayer Book Society, embracing within its bounds six of our western counties, is that which above all others you delight to honour, as it is the only one you deemed proper to introduce to the notice of the last Convention, and you speak of it in your charge, as "distinguished for its zealous exertions." Wonderful as it may seem, this Society which is so high in your favour, has disregarded the *cardinal principle*, "the *combined* distribution of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer," and has violated the Scriptural plan of evangelizing the world, for we are informed in the *Christian Journal* for 1822, page 368, "In consequence of the general distribution of the Bible by the "laudable exertions of others, and the pressing demands for the "Book of Common Prayer, the attention of the Society *since its* "*commencement*, has been turned to the distribution of that invaluable manual of devotion." That is, this Bible and Prayer Book Society has appropriated all its funds to the distribution of Prayer Books, and has never owned a *single Bible*.

These facts ill accord with the opinions we have seen expressed, respecting the Scriptural plan of presenting in conjunction the *Word* and the *Church* of God. To distribute Bibles without Prayer Books, is unscriptural,—is throwing away the precious fruits of the reformation—is hazarding our apostolic ministry, &c. &c. But to distribute *Prayer Books* without Bibles, does no injury to the Church, and offers no violence to the consciences of these orthodox and consistent Churchmen. These Societies while circulating Prayer Books, are careful to retain the word "Bible" in their title, and thus

" They keep the word of promise to our ear,
" And break it to our hope."

These institutions not only damp in Episcopalians that zeal for the diffusion of the Scriptures, which is the most remarkable characteristic of the present day ; but they prevent the adoption of the most efficient means for putting the Liturgy of our Church into the hands of her indigent members. By their avowed opposition to Bible Societies they lose the patronage of many Episcopalians whose conduct in supporting them, these Societies think

proper to condemn ; and although most of their funds are expended in printing and circulating Prayer Books, yet it is found necessary in order to save appearances, to appropriate some portion of them to the distribution of the Scriptures.* Whereas, were *Prayer Book Societies* established in their room, they would receive the patronage of all Churchmen, and might devote their undivided resources to the dissemination of our own invaluable Liturgy and Articles.

Another most serious objection to these Societies, is the schism they produce and the parties they form in our Church—We have seen that they denounce Bible Societies as unscriptural, because they do not present the *Church* of God in conjunction with his Word, and declare that they “in conscience believe” the very associations recommended by the House of Bishops, to be a departure “from the true and primitive method of propagating Christianity.” You Sir, warn your flock that in joining Bible Societies, they “put in jeopardy their apostolic ministry and primitive and “evangelical worship,” while your “venerable father in the Epis-

* As the Stereotype edition of the Bible printed by the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society, may be regarded as invalidating in some degree the statements I have made, it may not be amiss to give a few facts relative to this subject. The expense of the plates was not defrayed out of the funds of the Society, for the managers in their third Report, inform us that “they did not feel authorized to withdraw any part of the money then employed in circulating the Book of Common Prayer.” The Managers therefore made an appeal to the public for this specific object, and they state (3rd Report) “the result has fully justified the appeal,” and they give notice that “the list of subscribers to this work of Christian charity, will be published as soon as the subscriptions are completed.” In their 5th Report, they incautiously disclose their object in printing an edition. “Your Managers did not fear to publish an edition of the Bible, even though the state of the funds would not allow of immediate payment for it—we were confident of being “able to dispose of the books at a profit to the Society.” It would seem however that this speculation has not been successful, since it does not appear, that the last year they have sold a single copy. Let it be recollected that the American Bible Society had for sale, and would have sold to this Society at *cost price*, well executed Stereotype Bibles of three different sizes, and that Bible Societies throughout the union find it their interest to purchase these Bibles. The New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society was not therefore induced to procure these plates from any difficulty they experienced in purchasing Bibles ; but it seems they sagaciously imagined, that could they procure the plates free of expense, they would be able to *sell* Bibles at a profit, and thus the *sale* of the Scriptures would augment the distribution of the Prayer Book.

“copacy” assures us, that with the plan of Bible Societies, as adopted in England and America, “there can be no dissatisfaction on account of interfering opinions or modes of worship.” Bishop White considers Bible Societies “as being one of the happiest expedients ever devised for spreading the knowledge of Christ.” You, on the other hand, regard the Prayer Book as a still more happy expedient, since “we distribute the holy Scriptures in the manner best calculated,” &c.

On turning to other dioceses, we find the members of our Church generally uniting with their fellow Christians in distributing the Scriptures, and among themselves, in distributing the Prayer Book, Homilies, and Tracts. The Episcopalians of Pennsylvania, as if totally ignorant of the sin of separating “the Word and the Church of God,” have formed “the Common Prayer Book Society of Pennsylvania;” and in their first Report they make the following bold avowal “in the exercise of Christian charity we will unite “with our brethren of other denominations in the great and pious “work of distributing the Scriptures.” The Episcopalians of the the eastern diocess anxious to disseminate the doctrines of their Church, have established “the Prayer Book and Tract Society of the eastern diocess.” The convention of Virginia, disregarding “the cardinal principle,” have by a formal vote established “the Common Prayer Book and Tract Society of Virginia,” and the convention of North Carolina have by a vote recorded on their journals, recommended to the clergy of that diocess “the organization of Prayer Book Societies in their respective congregations,” little imagining that they were thus advising their clergy to “throw away the precious fruits of the reformation.” In Maryland also we find a Prayer Book and Homily Society under the presidency of the bishop.

Thus we see sir, that in no less than five dioceses the *divine* method of spreading religious truth by holding out the Church of God in connexion with his Word, through the means of Bible and Prayer Book Societies, as recommended by Dr. How and yourself, is utterly disregarded. Can it be denied that these Societies in declaring Bible Societies to be unscriptural and dangerous, and their own plan to be that alone which is sanctioned by divine authority, are acting in direct opposition to the sentiments of an immense majority in the Church; that they are interrupting her peace, bringing her authority into contempt, and forming parties

among her members ? You inform us Sir, in your "Catechism for Confirmation," page 25, "We also commit the sin of schism when "we promote parties and divisions in the Church, or in any way "disturb its peace." "The apostles regarded even the lowest "degree of schism, making parties in the Church, *a carnal sin.*" And if on the subject of Bible Societies, there be now "parties and divisions" in the Church, and if her peace be disturbed, to whom will attach the carnal sin of creating the schism ? To the House of Bishops who recommended them, or to the single Bishop who has denounced them ?

It is now time, that agreeably to my promise, I should consider your assertion that Bible Societies "tend to weaken the zeal of "Episcopalians in favour of those distinguishing principles which "eminently entitle her to the appellation of apostolic and primitive." Passing over the remarkable circumstance, that the House of Bishops should have been so weak and short sighted as to recommend institutions exerting such disastrous influence upon Episcopalians, I will apply to our Church, the words of the celebrated Dr. Clark of Cambridge, "So soon as it shall be proved that the distribution "of the Bible alone is hostile to the interests of the established "Church, then, and then only, be that Church subverted."

Bible Societies have now been in operation in this country for fourteen years, and it is to be regretted, that you do not favour us with some of the *facts* on which you found your assertion. If the zeal of Episcopalians for their Church, were to be determined solely by their *professions*, I should be compelled I admit, to yield the precedency to the opponents of Bible Societies ; but it is to *actions* and not professions to which I appeal to repel your injurious insinuation. If we turn to England we find those great institutions, the Church Missionary Society, the Church of England Tract Society, the Society for the conversion of the Jews, and the Prayer Book and Homily Society, all of them identified with the interests of the established Church, supported almost exclusively, by the Episcopal members of the Bible Society. Let us Sir, inquire particularly into the operations of the Church Missionary Society, and the Prayer Book and Homily Society, since it is admitted that these institutions are supported by the Episcopal friends of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and are on that account subjected to the frowns and abuse of its opponents. The income of

the Church Missionary Society amounted last year to \$146,000. It employs as missionaries, schoolmasters, &c., 200 persons. It is educating not less than 10,500 heathen children, and has missionary stations in the four quarters of the globe. It placed \$22,000 at the disposal of the Bishop of Calcutta, for the use of the Missionary College established by his Lordship; and it supports a College at Cotym for the improvement of the Syrian Church, in which there are now twenty-one students, who are intended for the ministry; and is thus preparing the way for a union between the Church of England and this ancient and apostolic, but long persecuted Church. The Prayer Book and Homily Society have in nine years distributed 80,000 Prayer Books, and about half a million of Homilies, Articles, and Ordination Services in tracts. They have published the Liturgy in Irish, Welch, Modern Greek, Chinese, Hindoostanee, and also for the use of the Syrian Christians, in Tamul and Malayalim. They have published Homilies in English, Manks, Welch, French, Italian, Spanish, and German. All this it must be confessed, does not look as if the British and Foreign Bible Society had paralyzed the zeal of its Episcopal members, for their own Church; nor do the numerous Prayer Book and Tract Societies I have already mentioned, in the other Dioceses at home, favour your theory that Bible Societies tend to weaken the zeal of Episcopalians "in favour of the distinguishing principles of their Church." Let it be recollected that the President of the Pennsylvania Prayer Book Society, the Hon. William Tilghman, is one of the Vice Presidents of the American Bible Society. The following extract from the Report of a Prayer Book Society in your own Diocese, established in the congregation to which the President of the National Bible Society belongs, indicates, it must be admitted, no want of attachment to the Church.

"The most diffusive Christian charity, is perfectly consistent
 "with a zealous attachment to the particular denomination of
 "which we are members. With our fellow Christians of every
 "name, we are ready to unite in spreading abroad the records of
 "our common salvation; and with the Apostle, we pray, that
 "grace may be with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sin-
 "cerity. But we turn with fond and peculiar regard to that
 "Church in whose bosom we were nurtured, and in whose words
 "our infant lips were taught to utter the accents of prayer and
 "praise. May peace be within her walls, and prosperity within

“ her palaces ; may her priests be clothed with salvation, and her saints shout aloud for joy.”*

If you really doubt the attachment of the Episcopal members of Bible Societies to the liturgy and doctrines of the Church, give them an opportunity of evincing it. Let one of the two Bible and Prayer Book Societies in this city, drop the word “ Bible ” in its title, and let it no longer pretend that it is a sin to give Bibles without Prayer Books, and I pledge myself, that in one year, its issues of Prayer Books will be double the present number.

It has been sometimes maintained that Bible Societies tended to contract the circulation of the Prayer Book. The following admission of the New-York Auxiliary Bible and Prayer Book Society relieves me from the labour of disproving so idle a suggestion. “ With the multiplied and growing facilities of obtaining the Bible, “ is the demand for the Book of Common Prayer increased.” *Third Report.*

Although in your opinion the distribution of the Bible *and* Prayer Book in conjunction, will be the means “ of bringing to a world disconsolate and dreary, the comforts of Heaven ; ” I must be permitted, with great deference to doubt, whether the comforts of Heaven will ever be brought generally and effectually to the world, except through the preaching of the Gospel, by a Christian Ministry. The general Convention of our Church, sensible of the duty of Christians, to extend the comforts of their religion to their fellow men, of every name and nation, have established the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. At the head of this institution, we find the Bishop of Pennsylvania, the able and zealous advocate of Bible Societies. In his address, in behalf of the Society, he urges the duty and importance of foreign missions, and exclaims ; “ Who can calculate the effects of this new plan for the evangelizing of the world ? And who can tell whether it may not be the expedient in the counsels of divine wisdom, for the fulfilment of the promise to the Messiah, of giving him the heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession ? ” This Society has received the cordial support of the Episcopal members of Bible Societies, and the President of the American Bible Society, is numbered among its patrons, and liberal benefactors. One of the means devised by the General Convention, for pro-

* Report of Bedford Prayer-Book Society.—*Wash. Theo. Repository*, Vol. IV. page 31.

viding funds for this Society, is the establishment of Auxiliary Societies, and such Societies are now rapidly forming in Pennsylvania, and elsewhere. And is there an Episcopalian to be found, who objects to these associations,—associations recommended by the great council of his Church, and intended to extend that Church, both at home and abroad? I know of but one individual who objects to the formation of Auxiliary Societies, and his zeal has not been weakened by connexion with Bible Societies. In your late charge, after giving a freezing recommendation of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, “so far as may be compatible with the claims of this Diocese, where there is so extensive a field for missionary exertions.” You proceed: “I should much fear however, that any plan of *constant and permanent* operation, *such as the constituting of Auxiliary Societies*, would essentially interfere with the missionary system of *this* Diocese, which has been so successful in its operation, and to which we are indebted for the organization of many new congregations, and for the resuscitation of some which were nearly extinct.” And will the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society interfere with the missionary system of this Diocese in its efforts for the conversion of the heathen? In what spot Sir, out of the bounds of this Diocese, does the New-York Episcopal Missionary, proclaim the glad tidings of salvation? Alas Sir, the missionary system of which you speak, is but another illustration of your maxim, that it is the duty of Episcopalians “to bend *all* their efforts for the advancement of *their own Church*.”

It is not now my object, to question the utility or propriety of our missionary system; but still I must be permitted to believe, that the command of the ascending Redeemer; “Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature,” has not been revoked; and that no Church, which systematically refuses obedience to this command, will permanently flourish. Those sects among us, which are increasing most rapidly at home, are those which make the greatest exertions abroad. If we postpone our endeavours for the conversion of the heathen, till there shall be no nonepiscopalians in New-York, the great day of account will find the duty unperformed. Other Dioceses have also their missionary systems, but no other Bishop has to my knowledge objected to the formation of Auxiliary Societies.

We have thus seen that Bible Societies have not weakened the

zeal of Episcopalians generally in the distribution of their liturgy, or in missionary endeavours to extend their Church, either in Great Britain or America.

Let us now inquire whether those Clergymen of our Church, who in opposition to your advice have supported Bible Societies have been less zealous and faithful in the discharge of their parochial duties, than their brethren who have bowed submissively to your authority? On the establishment of the American Bible Society, you intimated in the newspapers, in an address under your own signature, that connexion with Bible Societies had a tendency to produce in Episcopalians "an indolent indifference" towards the principles of the Church, and you anticipated "serious injury to the Church in this Diocess" from the union of Churchmen in the National Society. After the experience of six years, you now again advance similar sentiments; and solemnly declare in your charge, that Bible Societies have a tendency to lessen the zeal of Episcopalians in favour of the distinguishing principles of their Church. It is to be presumed that an assertion, so seriously affecting the characters and conduct of no small portion of your flock, is founded upon *facts* within your own observation, and it is to be regretted, that you have not thought proper to specify them. Now it is all important to such of your Clergy as have incurred the responsibility of joining Bible Societies, to prove that *their* zeal has not been paralyzed; and this can only be done by a comparison of the result of their ministerial labours, with those of their brethren. Such a comparison however invidious and painful, is now rendered necessary to the defence of their own characters; and surely he ought not to be deemed guilty of cruelty or unkindness, who in warding off the blows which are aimed at himself, should happen to wound his assailant. In this investigation, it is evident that we must look for our facts at *home*; and suffer me to offer the three Episcopal Rectors in this city, who are connected with the American Bible Society, as the representatives of their associates throughout the Diocess. The influence of this institution in weakening the zeal of Episcopalians, has in this city, had a fair and thorough experiment. It is here, that it is carrying on its operations in all their imposing grandeur and magnificence; here are held the monthly meetings of its managers, including its clerical members; and here are celebrated its anniversaries at which, the three Clergymen alluded to, have mingled their notes of gratulation and en-

couragement, with those of their fellow Christians. If the zeal of these gentlemen has passed unhurt through this fiery trial—nay, if it be still as active and ardent as that of *any* of their brethren, then surely Sir, your fears have been groundless, and you will be almost induced to welcome the Society as an Auxiliary to the Church.

On the 28th of January, 1817, Dr. How, in an address delivered in St. Paul's Church, recommended the organization of Sunday Schools in the Episcopal Churches in New-York. At the moment this address was delivered, there were 53 Sunday Schools in full and successful operation in this city, embracing about 6000 scholars. And did the Episcopal Churches Sir, deserve the reproach implied in Dr. How's monition? Had our pastors so long delayed to establish these nurseries of the Church? Had they been so long indifferent to the spiritual sustenance of the lambs of their flocks, while the Pastors of other Churches were training up 6000 children to virtue and piety in Sunday Schools? However humiliating the confession, it is nevertheless required by truth and justice, that at the period of Dr. How's address, no Sunday School was established in any Episcopal Congregation in the city, whose Rector did not belong to the American Bible Society; and it is equally true, that at the same time, *there were flourishing Sunday Schools in every Episcopal Congregation in the city whose Rector did belong to that Society; viz.—in St. Michael's, St. George's, and Christ Church.* We may, therefore, safely conclude that Bible Societies do not weaken the zeal of our Clergy, for the spiritual instruction of the young, and the indigent.

I shall adduce but one more instance to disprove your opinion of the benumbing influence of Bible Societies upon the zeal of Episcopalians, and it will I trust be conclusive. I can imagine no surer touchstone of ministerial zeal and faithfulness, than the number of those who are brought to kneel at the Altar of their Saviour; and in receiving the symbols and pledges of his love, to acknowledge Him before men. By this test, I am willing that the zeal of the clerical members of Bible Societies should be tried, confident that in every instance, *ceteris paribus*, those Clergymen who support these associations, will be found more successful in their parochial labours than their less Catholic Brethren. The opposition to Bible Societies in this Diocese, has proceeded almost exclusively from the Pastors of Trinity Church and her associated Chapels; it will

therefore not be irrelevant to our subject, to inquire whether they have been instrumental in adding a greater number to the communion of our Church, than their Brethren in the city, whose connexion with Bible Societies, they think proper to condemn. Our Church in one of her Canons* makes it the duty of every Minister to "keep a register of the names of the communicants within his cure;" justly esteeming him a careless shepherd, who either does not know his sheep, or omits to take their number. For four successive years commencing with 1804, the communicants of Trinity Church are stated at or about "1000." In 1808, the Chapel of St. John's was added, and yet for four more successive years, we are still presented with the same unvarying report of "about 1000." Sometimes we are informed, that this number is ascertained "by estimation." In 1812, the Chapel of St. George's was erected into an independent Church, and we learn from the report in that year, of the officiating Minister, that its communicants amounted to between 60 and 80, thus leaving to Trinity, St. Paul's and St. John's, more than 900 communicants, or an average of upwards of 300. Is it not wonderful Sir, that the *same sermons* which in Trinity, St. Paul's and St. John's, had drawn such crowds to the Altar should at St. George's, one of the largest and oldest Churches in our city, have been heard with so little effect. After the separation of St. George's, the total amount remaining in the three Churches, is stated at 700, and the deduction of 300 from the usual "1000" is ascribed to the separation of St. George's, and the establishment of new congregations in the city. We have seen that St. George's only took off 80 communicants, leaving 220 who had joined the new congregations. This sudden secession to new Churches, is the more surprising when we recollect, that the erection of Grace Church, only separated from the yard of Trinity by a narrow street, made no deduction from, nor the annexation of the new Church of St. John's, any addition to, the unvarying "1000." We are not informed what new congregations they were, which had deprived Trinity of so large a portion of her communicants, and I have looked in vain in the journal of the convention, for the year in which the fact is announced, to find a notice of the formation of *one* new congregation in the city. The communicants of Trinity after sustaining this heavy loss, were for

* 4th Canon, 1796.

several years reported at 700 ; at last they rose to "between 700 and 800," and in this middle station they have remained for the last *five* years. Let us now Sir trace the progress of that unfortunate Chapel, which, on separating from Trinity, beheld her own altar nearly deserted, while it appeared from the parochial reports, that those of her late associates were thronged. The first report from this Church in 1812, as we have seen, states the communicants at between 60 and 80. We have no report again till 1816, when Dr. Milnor, the present Rector and the Secretary of the American Bible Society, being called to its Rectorship, reported that he found 130 communicants. His last report, states the number at 432, more than belong to any other episcopal Church in the city, and the particulars of his statement, viz.—"added within the year 58, died 11—removed 29," look as if the number was given, not "by estimation," but from "the Register," required by the Canon. The communicants of Christ Church are reported at 250, and those of St. Michael's at 400, thus making a total of 1082 for the three Churches, whose Rectors are members of the American Bible Society. And do these facts Sir, confirm you in your opinion, that these Rectors by joining that Society, ran the hazard of occasioning very serious injury to the Church in this "Diocess?" They may indeed have been the unwilling cause of "wounding the feelings and diminishing the influence" of one whose station and character alike entitle him to their respect ; but recollect Sir, that they could not have avoided these consequences, without wounding their own consciences ; and recollect also Sir, that their feelings and their influence, have not always been consulted by their opponents.

I trust I have now shown, that connexion with Bible Societies, does not necessarily weaken the zeal of Episcopalians, nor endanger the Church. Suffer me now to ask you, whether continued opposition will not probably be instrumental in "occasioning very serious injury" to our Church ; in "interrupting her harmony—" "arresting the spirit of zeal for her principles which is now leading her to prosperity," and in "wounding the feelings and diminishing the influence of those intrusted with the management of her concerns?"

We have already seen. that some of our opponents have declared, that in their conscience they believe that very system so strenuously recommended by the House of Bishops, to be "a de-

“parture from the true and primitive method of propagating the “knowledge of God.” And can the authority and Christian prudence of our Bishops be thus questioned, without “hurting *their* “feelings, and diminishing their influence?” Can parties be engendered in the very bosom of the Church, without interrupting her harmony, and occasioning very serious injury to her interests. *Acerrima proximorum odia*. Parties cannot long exist, without their distinctive names ; and if our clergy are unhappily beginning to be known as *evangelical* or otherwise, the distinction is to be attributed in no small degree to the opposition made by a party in the Church, to Bible Societies. New proofs of the disastrous influence which this party exercises on the rising prosperity of our Church, are constantly occurring.

The establishment of a general Theological Seminary was long an object of devout anticipation and endeavour on the part of the pious members of our Church. The superior advantages which would necessarily flow from a concentration of funds, and the consequent establishment of an extensive library and the liberal endowment of professorships, compared with the crippled resources and feeble efforts of local institutions, were so obvious, that not a murmur of disapprobation to the plan was heard throughout our Church ; except in the Diocese of New-York. The opposition in New-York ceased, the moment the general Seminary was virtually placed under her own control ; and almost immediately it breaks out in various sections of the Church. Virginia has established her Seminary, and invited North Carolina to unite with her. Maryland has just established her Seminary. The Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, as appears from his late charge, withholds his countenance, and all hope of a general, vigorous, and systematic support of the Theological Seminary by the Church at large, is now at an end. And can we attribute this sudden change in the sentiments of large portions of our Church, to any other cause than a fear that those peculiar principles which are maintained with so much earnestness in this Diocese, and which have led to an unwearied opposition to Bible Societies, would be inculcated in the general Seminary. These same principles we have seen produce in this Diocese, a lukewarmness almost amounting to hostility, towards the designs of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society ; the only instrument devised by the Episcopalians of America for the conversion of the Heathen world.

Another evil arising from this opposition, is the diminished reverence for the Word of God to which it naturally leads ; and the inducement it offers to the rash attempt of elevating the Liturgy into competition with the sacred volume. To these consequences is still to be added the unkind and unchristian feelings which it engenders, towards those who adopt different opinions, and pursue a different conduct. This last remark, cannot certainly, Sir, be applied in its full force to you. While you have not scrupled frankly, and publicly to impute to Bible Societies, an unscriptural character, and dangerous tendency ; you have refrained from impeaching the motives of their supporters ; and have uniformly conducted the controversy with the forbearance of a Christian, and the urbanity of a gentleman. But unfortunately Sir, your associates on the other side of the Atlantic, have defended your principles, in a manner which reflects disgrace, both upon themselves, and the Church of which they are members, and which cannot but wound the interests of religion itself. The asperity and malignancy which now mark the hostility in England, afford a salutary lesson to us, and teach us that we cannot long oppose the diffusion of the oracles of truth, without finding their influence on our hearts and dispositions gradually weakened, and without being driven to seek for arguments to support our cause, on the very confines of infidelity. Do you accuse me, Sir, of exaggeration or unkindness ? I appeal to the following passage of the 1st report of a district committee of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge for the Deanery of Henly, in Oxfordshire, dated in 1820. After declaring that they do not think it “ altogether safe to commit the inspired writings into the hands of the illiterate ” without interpretations, &c. and drawing a comparison between their own plan and that of the Bible Society, they proceed : “ It is indeed “ a singular coincidence, that the daring advance of blasphemy “ has been commensurate with the accelerated progress of scrip- “ tural knowledge ; and *never did infidelity appear abroad with “ such bold and disgusting effrontery as we now behold it, since the “ Bible has been indiscriminately put into the hands of the people “ without note or comment.*” Within the period here alluded to, the Prayer Book, and Church of England Tracts, have been circulated to an extent unparalleled in the history of the established Church ; and yet, instead of imputing the advance of blasphemy and infidelity to these productions of fallible men : or of ascribing

it to the demoralizing influence of a protracted war, to an increased population, or to extensive pecuniary embarrassments; these gentlemen in their rage against Bible Societies, can see no other agent in the production of the general profligacy, than that volume which has God for its author, truth for its matter, and salvation for its end! Speaking of Bible associations, the British Critic for 1815, exclaims, "For what honest, for what good, and for what Christian purpose, are the poor of this country to be taxed a penny a week in support of a Society whose income exceeds its expenditures? To deduct such a sum from a poor family, is *a cruel, a wicked, an unchristian act.*" And yet this cruelty and wickedness were chargeable upon a majority of the Bishops of the establishment, for at this time more than half the Bishops patronised Bible Societies.

But amid all the calumniators of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the name of NORRIS stands pre-eminent.

"Aw'd by no shame, by no respect controll'd,
"In scandal busy, in reproaches bold,"

This modern Thersites, even while ministering at the altar of his God, scruples not to load his most devoted servants, with the foulest obloquy; and labours with the malignity of an infidel, to prove the corrupting influence of the Holy Scriptures, upon the public morals.

"From such apostles, O ye mitred heads!
"Preserve the Church."

In the year 1814, this man first obtruded himself on the public notice, as the author of "A practical exposition of the tendency and proceedings of the British and Foreign Bible Society." Of the bitterness of that work, the following sample will suffice. "Those who so loudly proclaim the cause of the Bible Society to be the cause of God: who cry out to the deluded people, why come ye not up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, are the legitimate descendants of those notable *incendiaries*, who never ceased to curse Meroz and neutrality, until in the language of Walker, they had brought God's curse upon the land; and put Church and Commonwealth into a flame."—p. 285.

Of this same work, the Bishop of St. Davids, thus speaks in his tract, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, the religion of Protest-

“ants.” “It is so destitute of the demonstration which it professes to give : so defective in its premises : so inconclusive in its inferences ; and so reprehensible in its *calumnies* respecting the Church members of the Society,” that it may be left “to its own refutation.”

Is it not Sir astonishing, that a man thus degrading his holy calling, should find in this country a correspondent in the person of “a distinguished American ?” A correspondent who mourns with him over the progress of the everlasting Gospel, and bewails every new instance of patronage bestowed on institutions whose only object, is to furnish his fellow men, with the records of salvation !! On the first page of this man’s recent letter to Lord Liverpool, after pointing out the mischievous effects of his Lordship’s speech in favour of the Bible Society he proceeds, “but our own shores are not the limits of its injurious operation, for I have before me a communication from a distinguished American, who bewails the accession of popularity, that Societies there, *hostile to that Church* have derived from inferences, which we happily know to be false, of a disposition in the English ministry to patronise Sectarism, drawn from this speech, which is most studiously propagated by the American newspapers, throughout the United States.”

It thus appears that it was not till *after* this distinguished American, had condescended to complain to Mr. Norris of Lord Liverpool’s speech, that Mr. Norris resolved to write his letter ; and it is therefore to this distinguished personage that the community are probably indebted for this indecent pamphlet ; and perhaps to the same agency, for its republication in this country as an auxiliary to your charge. These considerations give to the letter of Norris, a degree of importance to which it would not be otherwise entitled. It is interesting to know something of the foreign correspondents of distinguished Americans ; and it is curious and useful to observe, how a mistaken zeal, vitiates the moral appetite, and renders palatable the most nauseous ribaldries, if uttered by a partisan.

Permit me Sir, to call your attention to the following extracts, as exhibiting the character of a work sold by your bookseller, and the republication of which on this side of the Atlantic, was unquestionably intended, to give full effect to the blow aimed in your charge, at the American Bible Society.

Of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Hackney Curate

thus speaks. "I protest solemnly to your Lordship, appealing to the Searcher of all hearts for the sincerity of my protestation, that in my conscience I believe, that quietness, peace, and love, have rarely been assailed by a confederacy from which *all Christian people have more to dread*, than is threatened by this institution." Of the members of this Society, he gives the following character and comparison. "I know from long experience with *Bible Society* propagandists, their talent at misrepresentation." "Even in the first age of the Gospel, my Lord, when inspired Apostles promoted Christianity, there was an unaccountable propensity amongst Christians, to subject themselves to *deceitful workers* in religious matters. These, as we see St. Paul complaining to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi. 20) might bring them into bondage, devour them, smite them on the face, i. e. palm any vain conceit, *fleece them of their substance to any extent*, or practise any degree of spiritual tyranny upon them, and be suffered gladly in all this *craft and exaction*." The gentlemen of the Parent Society who occasionally assist at the meetings of the Auxiliaries, are thus likened to certain well known atheists and jacobins. "Its travelling agitators are such complete adepts in getting up these encœnia, that there would be as effectual security taken to keep down every expression, look, or gesture, which could excite a moment's jealousy in your Lordship's mind, as the *German illumines* were wont to take in their exoteric exhibitions, to repress whatever might give umbrage to their noble and royal patrons."

In allusion to Auxiliary Societies, and Bible Associations, he observes, "In the very highest degrees of the order, viz. the *Illumines*, there were *modified* mysteries for those who by their rank were to serve for a protection to its *plots*, without knowing their tendency."

A late excellent work on the practical details of Bible Institutions, by a gentleman of the name of Dudley; is "Bible Society Craft, made easy to the meanest capacity." Of the agency of females in soliciting subscriptions, and in forming associations for the diffusion of the Scriptures, he thus expresses himself: "The delicate office of extortioners to the Society, is assigned over to the ladies, who are for this purpose embodied in a sub-society. a male counsellor or two being charged with the duty of regular attendance upon their meetings; to act as a sort of safety valve to

“ a machine containing highly effervescent ingredients.” “ In that
 “ horrid letter from Baron Distfurt, under the *illuminized* designa-
 “ tion of Minos, to Sebastian, another conspirator, suggesting the plan
 “ of a *Female Illumine Association*, which is recorded by Professor
 “ Robinson in his proofs of a conspiracy ; the *same male* oversight
 “ to give the proper tone to the proceedings, is laid down as in-
 “ dispensable ! Ptolemy’s wife must direct them, and she will be
 “ instructed by Ptolemy, and my step-daughter will consult with
 “ me. We must always be at hand to prevent the introduction of
 “ improper questions. We must prepare themes for their discus-
 “ sion, thus we shall confess them, and inspire them with our sen-
 “ timents.”

“ The progress of *female demoralization*, amongst that portion of
 “ the *sex* which has fallen a prey to Bible Society beguilements,
 “ might be traced by one who had the daily registers of the period
 “ within his reach, and sufficient command of time for investigation:
 “ that it has been progressive, is well known to those who have
 “ been observers of the Bible Society’s plans.” After quoting
 some well meant, but perhaps rather injudicious encomiums on the
 participation of females in the great work of diffusing the Scrip-
 tures, he adds, “ If females can be induced to give a hearing to such
 “ rapsodies as these, the result must be *what we now experience*.
 “ St. Paul in his second Epistle to Timothy, has set down both
 “ their character and their condemnation—they must be led cap-
 “ tive at the will of those to whom they so disreputably listen ;
 “ and be driven to *any* lengths to which these men may urge them
 “ on in the furtherance of their *designs*.”

It is thought most adviseable in the management of Ladies’ Bible
 Societies in England, that the subscriptions of their members
 should be collected by persons of their own sex ; and their by-laws
 frequently require, that “ each district where convenient, shall
 “ have two or more members of the Committee, attached to it as
 “ Collectors, and that in all practicable cases, a matron and a younger
 “ lady shall be colleagues.” This rule is declared by our Curate,
 to be an “ obviously wicked device of sending forth in couples a
 “ young lady and her *duenna* to give her confidence, to tutor her
 “ in playing off her *winning airs* and to cover her retreat in case
 “ of an unwelcome reception.” Another common regulation it
 seems is, that every young lady, who obtains six or more weekly
 contributors, shall have the privilege of attending the meetings of

the ladies who are the managers of the Society, and this regulation is denounced as "equally demoralizing;" and the author invokes upon the British and Foreign Bible Society "the indignation of every man who knows what genuine *domestic* happiness is, and desires to transmit that blessing to his posterity."

Mr. C. S. Dudley, a member of the Society of Friends, whose indefatigable exertions in the cause of the Bible, entitle him to the gratitude of every friend to virtue and religion, is the "the Society's Sergeant Major in the female department," and is compared to a noted apostle of infidelity. "German *illuminism* it appears, had in Baron Knigge, a propagandist of equal energy: he is stated to have been next to Weishaupt, the most serviceable man in the order, and procured the greatest number of members."

Two more extracts, and I have done. "In the face of all the Bible Anecdotes, *tricked* out in such diversified particularity, I have no hesitation in denying it to have been any where practically demonstrated, that the Bible Society's labours have generally promoted Christianity, or in disputing the theory of this proposition, that there is *any tendency* in those labours, to promote it throughout the world." "I appeal to your Lordship whether, notwithstanding the greatly increased exertion of the Church during the period, *infidelity and blasphemy have not been gathering confidence, and spreading their contagion almost in equal ratio with the Bible Society's progression?*" "When the contempt brought upon the Scriptures by the Society's method of distributing them is considered—when moreover its terms of communion are added to the account, that the faith shall be held in diversity, instead of the unity of the Spirit, and propagated in discordance, instead of in the bond of peace, what other issue is to be expected, *than that righteousness of life, shall be also cast away and the utmost licentiousness, both in opinion and practice be established.*"

Think not Sir, that I have selected these passages for the purpose of exposing their falsehoods, and disproving their atrocious insinuations; this task, however easy, I have no intention to assume. It cannot be the duty of the friends of the Bible Society, to enter into discussion with every blackguard, who chooses to slander her; and her interests by no means demand such condescension, on the part of her advocates. This vile pamphlet, may, in the language of the Bishop of St. David's, applied to another work by the same author, be left "to its own refutation." My

object in noticing this publication, is to exhibit the true character of an Auxiliary, which you Sir, have at least tacitly acknowledged, and which, unless common fame and the assertions of your friends do you injustice, you have yourself been instrumental in introducing to the American public.

It is with grateful feelings of attachment for my own Church, that I can turn from the disgusting insults heaped upon the matronry of Great Britain* by this Hackney Curate to the following extracts from a vindication of Female Bible Societies, by the truly venerable Bishop of Pennsylvania. "If there should press on the minds of any of you, the apprehension of exceeding the bounds which the modesty of your sex prescribes, it does not appear to me, that there is the least ground for such reproach, so long as the association is within yourselves. As to the circumstance, that some of you will be called upon to act in certain official characters, necessary for the conducting of business, if we look beyond names, there is nothing in the subject itself but what would apply with equal force against the presiding at a dinner, or at a tea table ; unless indeed it could be alleged, that this is less alien from the female character, than the gathering and dispensing of alms." "Can it be out of the sphere of your sex to be actively engaged in disseminating a system of truth and morality, which has so excellent a bearing immediately on your interests ; and through you, on whatever contributes to the rectitude, to the decorum, and to all the rational enjoyments of social life ?"

"Contemplating the recent institution of Bible Societies, begun in England, and extending rapidly throughout the world, as a prodigious effort for raising of a mound against the threatened inundation of infidelity ; as being one of the happiest expedients which have been devised, for spreading the knowledge of the Gospel of

* Some idea may be formed of the class of females who are the subjects of Norris's-malignant aspersions, from the following names, selected from the officers of a Ladies' Bible Society in Ireland, viz.

Viscountess Lorton	Countess of Leitrim	Lady M. Knox
Lady E. Littlehales	Viscountess Lifford	Lady Lucy Barry
Countess of Meath	Lady C. Crofton	Lady H. Bernard
Lady Castlecoot	Hon. Mrs. Hewitt	

Of the Ladies Societies in England it is sufficient to say, that their Royal Highnesses, the Princess Augusta, and Dutchesses of Kent and Gloucester belong to them.

“Christ ; and as tending directly to the accomplishment of the
 “assurances given, that his kingdom will be at last coextensive
 “with the world ; I will not suffer myself to believe that *your sex*,
 “any more than ours, are debarred from promoting these blessed
 “ends in your *distinctive* character.” *Address to Philadelphia*
Female Bible Society.

I have now Sir, brought to a conclusion, my review of your strictures on Bible Societies, and have freely but I trust not disrespectfully examined the grounds, on which you rest your objections to the co-operation of Episcopalians, with others, in distributing the Holy Scriptures. I have not the vanity to believe, that I have effected any change in your opinions ; but I cannot refrain from humbly beseeching you, to reflect on the consequences to the peace and prosperity of the Church, which must result from your continued opposition to Bible Societies. A sense of duty no doubt prompted you, to endeavour to prevent the union of Episcopalians in these institutions ; and the zeal and perseverance with which you have made the attempt, are surely sufficient to satisfy the most scrupulous conscience. Is it not now time to pause, and to inquire whether duty requires, and the welfare of the Church will sanction, a farther continuance of this *unavailing* hostility. The history of Bible Societies, proves that opposition invariably strengthens and extends their influence. The British and Foreign Bible Society is becoming more and more deeply rooted in the affections of the British nation ; and the last Report declares, that the preceding year, was “one of the most prosperous which has occurred since its institution.” The loss of a portion of its Episcopal patronage, seems to have given new life and energy to the Hibernian Bible Society ; for during the past year, it has added twenty-five, to the list of its Auxiliaries, and an excess of £1,437 beyond the amount of the contributions of the preceding year, attest the happy influence which *opposition*, has exercised over its funds. The last Report of the American Bible Society also boasts, of an augmented income. On the establishment of this last Society, you attacked it in the newspapers, under your own signature ; you represented it as a Presbyterian institution ; you laboured to excite against it the jealousies of other denominations, and you prophesied, that it would be in “its spirit and management, the Bible Society of the particular city or district where it was established ;” that it could not, “in any sense be a National Society ;”

and that its "spirit and influence, and credit," would eventually be that, of the "Presbyterian denomination." The truth of predictions, can only be determined by time, and the confidence due to him who utters them, must be ascertained by the Scriptural rule, "If the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing, which the Lord hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it presumptuously : thou shalt not be afraid of him."

The aid which the American Bible Society has afforded, in the publication of the Scriptures, both in France and in India—the 268,177 volumes it has issued—its income of \$36,000—its 301 Auxiliaries, established in *every* state of the union, and in the territories of Michigan and Florida, and in the District of Columbia—its numerous and powerful patrons, including the President, Vice President of the United States, and the heads of the several departments of the general government—its Episcopal President—its six Episcopal Vice Presidents—its two Episcopal Secretaries—together with the nomination of every Committee in its Board of Directors, by its acting Episcopal Vice President—all give us, I think, some reason, to question the accuracy of your predictions. The Bishop of Peterborough, wearied with defeat, at length threw down his arms, and confessed that to oppose the Bible Society was like attempting to oppose a torrent of burning lava, that issues from Etna, or Vesuvius ; and think you Sir, that with all your newspaper publications, and your pastoral letters, and your addresses, and your Convention charges, you can stem that pure river of the water of life, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb, which is now refreshing and fertilizing the waste places of the earth, and causing the wilderness to rejoice and blossom as the rose ?

Be assured Sir, every blow you aim at Bible Societies, will recoil upon our own Church. Schism, unkindness, mutual reproaches, and unholy passions must inevitably result from a repetition of your attacks upon your fellow Churchmen, for supporting institutions, recommended to their patronage, by their assembled Bishops. The republication of Norris's pamphlet, and the applauses bestowed upon that malignant production by certain clergymen in New-York, indicate the growth of feelings as hostile to Christian charity, as they are to the harmony and prosperity of the Church.

There is Sir, a period approaching, when the friends and ene-

mies of Bible Societies will be alike compelled to relinquish their support and their hostility. In that hour of dissolving nature, when our distinctions, our triumphs and our defeats will all appear to us as less than the dust of the balance, and altogether vanity ; when the remembrance of no act of our lives will impart to us a ray of hope or consolation, farther than it affords an evidence of our faith in the Redeemer, and our love for his cause ; at that awful moment, when about to appear before that tribunal from whose judgment there is no appeal ; will our burthened consciences find comfort in the reflection, that we have laboured to destroy the only instrument by which the glad tidings of salvation could be conveyed to millions, who were ready to perish. The venerable Scott*, on his dying bed could exhort his friend, to persevere in his support of Bible Societies. The sainted Owen, sinking under the fatigue he had endured in the service of the British Society, and in full view of his approaching dissolution, could exclaim, “ how sweet to have toiled in this work !”

But I have yet to learn, that a single individual has expired, rejoicing in the opposition he had made to the circulation of the sacred volume, and anticipating for his efforts, the approving smile of his Maker. Many are the prayers to which I have listened, for the divine blessing on the cause I am defending ; but I doubt not, that my hardest opponent, would shrink from imploring the assistance of Heaven, in his labours to crush the very institutions, which he hesitates not to denounce, as dangerous and unscriptural.

It is with pain Sir, that I find myself compelled to differ with you, on any subject, and especially on one involving not only the character and welfare of our Church, but the dearest interests of the human family. But I trust you will find in the very importance of the subject, a sufficient apology for my adherence to that course of conduct which I believe to be correct ; and that you will extend to me, the same indulgence you claim yourself, for an independent compliance with a sense of duty. Although your sentiments with respect to Bible Societies will probably remain unaltered, yet I flatter myself, the hope is not presumptuous, that you will not deem it your duty to prolong this unhappy controversy ; and if new provocations must arise, that they will not again

* Author of the Commentaries.

proceed from a source to which the Church has a right to look for an example of long suffering, charity, and patience. You Sir, have zeal, talents and acquirements, meet for the Master's service : that they may be instrumental, not merely in enlarging the boundaries of the visible Church, but in adding to the number of those who shall inherit that Kingdom which He has prepared for them that love him ; and that you may receive the reward promised to them who turn many to righteousness, is the fervent prayer of

Right Reverend Sir,

Your very obedient servant,

A CHURCHMAN
Of the New-York Diocess.

New-York, April 22, 1828.

ERRATUM.

For "*St. Michael's*," wherever it occurs, read *St. Stephen's*.